

THE AMERICAN ✠ CHURCH ✠ MONTHLY

Selden Peabody Delany, D.D., Editor

January, 1920

Vol. 6 No. 5

Editorial Comment	-	-	-	-	420
A Studio Talk	-	-	-	-	430
<i>J. G. H. Barry</i>					
Further Observations on General Convention	-				446
<i>Charles Herbert Young</i>					
Some Recent Spiritualistic Literature	-	-			452
<i>Frank H. Hallock</i>					
Thoughts on "Saint's Progress"	-	-			469
<i>Christine Smith</i>					
Episcopalians or Churchmen	-	-	-		473
<i>Charles Carroll Edmunds</i>					
Objections to the Proposed Concordat	-	-			477
<i>Harry Howe Bogert</i>					
Eyes That See	-	-	-	-	481
<i>Stanley M. Cleveland</i>					
John the Baptist—A Study in Modernity	-				489
<i>H. Adye Prichard</i>					
Book Reviews	-	-	-	-	496

Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office, New Brunswick, N. J., under Act of March 3, 1879

Issued by the TEMPLE PUBLISHING CO., 42 Albany Street
New Brunswick, New Jersey

EDWIN S. GORHAM, Business Manager
OFFICES: 42 ALBANY STREET, NEW BRUNSWICK, N. J.
11 West 45th Street, New York, N. Y.

NEW OXFORD BOOKS

Essays on Vocation

Edited by BASIL MATHEWS

Net \$1.75

Twelve practical essays designed to aid in the selecting of one's life work. Two preliminary essays deal with general principles; the remainder are devoted to the special fields of the Ministry, Art, Law, Commercial and Industrial occupations, the University, Education, Medicine and Nursing. Each Essay is by an individual authority.

Donne's Sermons

Selected Passages, with an Essay

By LOGAN PEARSALL SMITH

Net \$3.00

Donne's fame as a preacher has long been due to Izaak Walton's description of his sermons rather than to acquaintance with the sermons themselves, yet Donne was not only a great divine but a great writer. Those passages which show him as a man, an artist, and writer form the basis of Mr. Smith's selection.

James Madison's Notes of Debates

In the Federal Convention of 1787 and their Relation to a more Perfect Society of Nations

By JAMES BROWN SCOTT

Net \$2.00

This highly interesting and valuable introduction to Madison's Notes of Debates in the Federal Convention of 1787 serves to emphasize the significance of the processes and reasonings of this Convention which led the Thirteen States to form the one large, successful and enduring union of the States in the annals of history and the value of Madison's Notes to the student of the larger problem of the Society of Nations.

Redemption

Hindu and Christian

By SIDNEY CAVE

Net \$5.25

A notably successful attempt to correlate the Christian doctrines of Redemption with that of Hinduism. The reader cannot go far into the book without feeling the spell of its luminous style and literary charm, not to mention its conspicuous fairness and obvious desire to reach the truth.

Modern China

A Political Study

By S. G. CHENG

Net \$3.25

A valuable and timely volume throwing a clear light on the chief problems of modern China with constructive suggestions for their solution. The discussion is notably temperate and free from political bias and deserves the close attention of all interested in Chinese matters.

*At all booksellers
or from the publishers*

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
American Branch

35 West 32nd Street
New York



In the Service of The King

Suggestions for Unifying the Parish System of Teaching and Training the Young Life of the Church. By FRANCES H. WITHERS, Secretary Junior Department of the Woman's Auxiliary. With Foreword by the Rev. LESTER BRADNER, Ph.D., Director of the Department of the Parochial Education, G. B. R. E. Cloth, 75 cts.

A committee of General Convention, headed by Bishop Lloyd, will report that the "Church Service League Plan" "for the development of the life of the young people of the Church" is the solution of our need in dealing with these. Miss Withers' book explains that plan. The fourteen graphic charts contained in it illuminate the much discussed "Junior Plan" and "Block" system. It is a word to the wise, full of suggestions, combining ideals and practice. It represents the new idea of united service to which the Church is turning so rapidly.

CONTENTS: The Aim of a School of Christian Nurture—Competition in the Parish—A Parochial Board of Education—Parish Cooperation—The Five Fields of Service—The Block System—The School in Action—The Mission Fields—Missionary Study—Funds: "Whence and Whither?"—The School and the Parish Apportionment—Relation of Pupils to Central Board—Home Cooperation—Some Suggested Standards for a School of Christian Nurture—A Survey of the School Situation.

All workers in Junior Auxiliary and Church Schools will require this book.

Reunion

By S. L. OLLARD, Hon. Canon of Worcester, Author of *A Short History of the Oxford Movement*. In the series of Handbooks of Catholic Faith and Practice. Price \$1.15.

Canon Ollard covers the ground historically, treating of the various movements looking toward Reunion that have been attempted since separation began. His chapters are, respectively: Reunion with the Roman Catholic Church, Reunion with the Eastern Church, Reunion with the Foreign Reformed, Home Reunion.

MOREHOUSE PUBLISHING COMPANY

1801-1811 Fond du Lac Avenue., Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

TO FOLLOW THE NATION-WIDE CAMPAIGN

THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH. Its Teaching and Worship. Instructions are given at the Chapel of the Intercession, New York, for Churchmen and Confirmation classes. By the Rev. LATTI GRISWOLD, M.A. Price, \$0.90. Cheap Edition, paper cover, 30c, for Confirmation Classes, Church Schools and distribution.

Fifth Thousand

An excellent Manual, well reasoned, temperate in expression, but definite in teaching.

Within its short compass it covers the historical, liturgical, and doctrinal aspects of the Book of Common Prayer.

"I feel sure the book is likely and deserves to be widely useful. It is good to find a book of the kind which is on thoroughly Catholic lines and at the same time does not go beyond what we are authorized to teach."—The Rt. Rev. Arthur C. A. Hall, D.D., Bishop of Vermont.

"Your book already has filled a place left vacant on my shelves—and I fancy also vacant in the libraries of all the clergy. It is just what the Church has long needed and it will be placed in the hands of many whose questions you answer admirably."—The Rt. Rev. James DeW. Perry, Jr., D.D., Bishop of Rhode Island.

"This little book gives the kind of instruction which is so greatly needed and it gives this in the spirit which cannot fail to commend it. Its value has been proved by the welcome which has been given it. I hope and believe that it will be found widely useful."—From the Rev. Wm. T. Manning, D.D.

Edwin S. Gorham, Publisher
NEW YORK

CONTRIBUTORS FOR JANUARY

The Rev. J. G. H. Barry, D.D., is Rector of the Church of St. Mary the Virgin, New York.

The Rev. Charles Herbert Young is Rector of Christ Church, Chicago, Illinois.

The Rev. Frank H. Hallock, D.D., is Professor *pro tem*, at the Western Theological Seminary, Chicago, Illinois.

Mrs. Christine Smith is a teacher in the Spence School for Girls, New York.

The Rev. Charles Carroll Edmunds, D.D., is Professor of the Literature and Interpretation of the New Testament, at the General Theological Seminary, New York.

The Rev. Harry Howe Bogert is Rector of St. Michaels' Church, Birdsboro, Pennsylvania.

The Rev. Stanley M. Cleveland is Curate at Trinity Church, Princeton, New Jersey.

The Rev. H. Adye Prichard is Rector of St. Mark's Church, Mt. Kisco, New York.

The American Church Monthly

*A Magazine of comment, criticism and review dealing
with questions confronting the Anglican Communion
and more especially the Church in the United States*

TEMPLE PUBLISHING CORPORATION

42 Albany St., New Brunswick, N. J.

President: GEORGE A. ARMOUR, Princeton, N. J.

Vice-President: GUY VAN AMRINGE, 55 Liberty Street, New York

Secretary: THE REV. CHARLES C. EDMUNDS, D.D., 6 Chelsea Square, New York

Treasurer: HALEY FISKE, 1 Madison Avenue, New York

Two Dollars a Year

Twenty Cents a Copy

Canadian subscription, \$2.25 a Year

Foreign subscription, \$2.50 a Year

Volume VI

JANUARY, 1920

Number 5

Further Hesitations on the Concordat

IT has taken time to recover breath and settle one's mind concerning the action of the General Convention of 1919 on the "Proposals for an Approach towards Unity," otherwise known as "The Concordat."

A proposition was submitted to the Convention providing for the necessary amendment of the Constitution. This cannot under the Constitution be acted on until 1922. A Joint Commission was appointed to see what ought to be done and to report in 1922.

Had the action of the Convention stopped there it would have received entire approval. It would have done what the Constitution authorized and no more. It would have manifested a sense of justice and a due regard for the opposition. But the action of the Convention did not stop there. It went much further and prejudged the case. It prejudged the great questions of Catholic Faith and Order that are necessarily involved and it violated the constitutional rights of the members of the Church in disagreement with it.

It is well known that when the "Proposals" were first presented they were objected to upon the ground that they were in their purpose impossible as in conflict with Catholic Faith and Order. The objection was denied by their advocates and a distinct issue was thus framed—was the purpose of the Proposals possible or impossible?

The opposition then pointed out that whether possible or impossible as regarded Catholic Faith and Order, there was a provision in Article VIII of the Constitution of the Protestant Episcopal Church which effectually prevented the enactment of the Canon suggested in and necessary to the Proposals.

Article VIII provided that no person should be ordained priest or deacon unless he should first subscribe a declaration to conform to the doctrine, discipline and worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

The advocates of the Concordat at last conceded that Article VIII was a bar to the introduction of their proposed Canon, and at the General Convention just held offered an amendment which under the Constitution cannot be acted on until the General Convention of 1922. This proposed amendment by adding words that in effect limit the signing of the declaration of conformity to priests or-

dained to serve in the Protestant Episcopal Church is supposed by its supporters to open the way for Bishops of that Church to confer valid orders on the ministers of other churches, and so make possible the enactment of the Canon which may carry the purposes of the Proposals into effect.

The introduction of the proposed Canon and all action in respect to the Concordat was thus necessarily postponed for three years. If at the General Convention in 1922 the amendment of Article VIII is adopted, the way might be thought open for the introduction of the proposed Canon. At that time and under those conditions the main question as to the possibility or impossibility of the purposes of the Concordat — that is their validity in point of Faith and Doctrine, could be presented for hearing and for judgment — *and not till then.*

The Convention of 1919 in its concurrent resolution states that "This Church declares its willingness to initiate action that may make possible the ordination" of ministers in other Christian bodies who accept the Scriptures, the Nicene Creed, and the two Sacraments, "under conditions which are stated in the aforementioned Proposals for an approach towards Unity." By this action the General Convention prejudged the entire case. Whether the purposes of the Proposals may be made possible or are flatly impossible is the precise question at issue, and is just as much at issue after the amendment of Article VIII since it is a question ultimately of Faith and Order and not of discipline or administration. As a question it was not before the Convention of 1919. It is *the* question to be decided in 1922. It is fundamental, and the membership of the Church had an inalienable right to be heard, unembarrassed by prejudgment, and to be represented on the hearing *by delegates elected by them on the issues presented.*

We repeat that the action of the General Convention, in conceding possibility to the purpose of the Proposals was an insupportable prejudgment of the case and an unqualified violation (however inadvertent) of the rights of the membership of the Church.

Did this Church, could this Church, declare any such willingness at this Convention? Could it declare any willingness at all or any mind in the matter until after the amendment of the Constitution in 1922? Obviously this Church did not and could not. If anyone supposed the Church was so declaring he was indulging in pure imagination. It was self-deception at the best, and the declaration was mischievous and misleading in the extreme. No majority at this Convention however strong could say, without violating the Constitution, that this Church declared her mind different from her declaration of it in the Constitution. The statement in the resolution imputing willingness to the Church is a grievous wrong to the opposition within the Church and an inexcusable misrepresentation of fact (however inadvertent) to all outside the Church. The opposition was entitled to the constitutional *status quo* until the Church should lawfully declare its mind in 1922. Of that it has been deprived *de facto* if not *de jure* and its case prejudged.

Spiritualism and the Communion of Saints

SPIRITUALISM is in the air. There are more books being bought and read on that subject than on any other. The war, with its appalling losses, has driven people to mediums by the thousands. Spiritistic communication now promises to displace faith healing as the reigning American fad. We must not be surprised if many people leave the Church and espouse Spiritualism as their religion.

It is all very well to say that the Church must meet this movement by re-emphasizing the old Catholic doctrine of the Communion of Saints. It will take more than the teaching of the doctrine to satisfy fathers and mothers who are longing to enter into communication with their beloved dead. We must put the doctrine into practice. We must on week days frequently celebrate Requiem Mass and on occasions say or sing the office of Vespers for the Dead. We must actually use in our extra-liturgical public devotions the Hail Mary and the Litany of the Saints. One of the chief faults of Anglicanism all along has been that it has held the Catholic faith only in a doctrinaire manner without really putting it into practice.

As an illustration of this Anglican habit we may refer to the story of an English vicar, who once remonstrated with his curate for preaching a very frank sermon on the sacrament of penance, in which he actually urged the people to come at one of the appointed hours for their confessions. The vicar said to his curate, "Of course I agree with you in substance; I have preached the Catholic doctrine of confession and absolution for thirty years, but the people never suspected that they would have to come and make their confessions. You must not be so outspoken. Teach the principle and let the people put it into practice."

This sort of teaching has been all too common in the Anglican Communion, and we suspect it is still the prevalent manner in which the doctrine of the Communion of Saints is taught to our people. So long as we continue to teach it without putting it into practice, we must not be startled if many of our people become unsettled in the faith, or ultimately lose their mental balance by dabbling in necromancy.

The Churchman on Pharisaism

IN a former editorial we intimated that we should like to know what the editor of the *Churchman* means by Pharisaism. He graciously replies in his issue of October 25, by supplying an illustration of the pharisaical spirit from the pages of the *American Church Monthly*. He quotes at some length a passage in which we criticized the Concordat for distributing the grace of holy orders in so haphazard a fashion; and in which we likened the revealed deposit of the Christian faith to a trust fund. This notion of the Christian revelation as an inviolable trust appears to be peculiarly irritating to the editor of the *Churchman*. He says: "Pharisaism was always apprehensive lest the deposit of Judaism might leak out among the Gentiles. What actually happened was that the Gentiles found access to other deposits. It was the Christ who taught them how."

Pharisaism then, according to the editor of the *Churchman*, is the crime of being loyal to the truth that God has once for all revealed through His Son Jesus Christ! Furthermore he places this revealed faith in the same category with the rabbinic traditions of Judaism!

If this be Pharisaism, the writers of the New Testament were badly tainted with it. St. John says: "If there come any unto you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed." St. Paul appeals to Timothy to be loyal to the faith which he had taught him: "O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust." In writing to the Galatians he says: "Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." In the Second Epistle of St. Peter, there are

some interesting remarks about false teachers who shall "bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them." St. Jude exhorts the brethren to "contend earnestly for the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints."

No doubt these things were written a long time ago, and the men who wrote them were far removed from the modern spirit of toleration and broad-mindedness. One can hardly imagine any of the Apostles saying that it made no difference what you believe. Possibly, however, the editor of the *Churchman* attaches little weight to their authority.

We are reminded of a story of two sisters of somewhat advanced age, who had all their life been faithful attendants at their historic parish church. Their rector, whom they long suspected of holding advanced views, finally introduced the startling innovation of making the Lord's Service the chief act of worship every Sunday at eleven. These two ladies, who had never attended the Lord's Service except on the first Sunday of the month, when they made their communions late, gave up coming to church. Their rector called on them to learn what was their grievance, and they complained to him that they had always been in the habit of receiving their communions on the first Sunday in the month, but now that he had the communion every Sunday they did not know when to receive. In any case they had never heard of such a practice as he had instituted. He asked them if they had never read in the Acts of the Apostles, how the early Christians were accustomed to meet together every Lord's Day for the breaking of bread. The ladies seemed somewhat puzzled for a moment, and then one of them exclaimed, "Oh, yes, we know the Apostles did that; but that was before the Reformation."

Mr. Hickson's Mission of Healing

WE are often asked what we think of Mr. Hickson and his mission of healing. It is by no means easy to give an answer. One never likes to pronounce a critical judgment upon any man who is striving to help people. Mr. Hickson claims to possess the gift of healing, which is one of the gifts of the Spirit mentioned by St. Paul in his Epistles. He lays hands upon the sick and prays for their recovery. He believes that if they come to him with faith in Christ, and with true repentance for their sins, the healing power of Christ will operate as truly today as it did during the years of our Lord's earthly ministry. He believes that it is the divine will that all sickness should be healed, and that what is necessary is simply that the sick person cooperate with God by faith, and by coming into contact with our Lord through the laying on of hands, or unction. He objects to limiting our prayers for recovery by the condition, "if it be Thy will," because he thinks God always wills our recovery.

The most obvious thing to say is that this is a very beautiful theory, but does it really work? Does Mr. Hickson as a matter of fact heal all who come to him with faith? Evidently he does not heal all who come to him. The Rev. Henry B. Wilson, in reporting the results of the mission in Boston, says:

"Some were helped, and others were not There were no records of cases of remarkable cure which are occasionally encountered at Lourdes and other places where pilgrimages are made to sacred shrines; cases pronounced incurable by science and afterwards acknowledged as cured by the same scientific inspection. No lame left crutches behind; none of those who came blind, departed seeing."

The following reason is given by Fr. Wilson for this failure to heal in many cases:

"There was not sufficient time or opportunity given to the preparation or awakening of a real faith in Christ's power to heal, or a real acknowledgment of God's desire to have His children healed."

The argument appears irrefutable. If you have sufficient faith in God you will be healed. You were not healed; therefore you did not have sufficient faith in God. One suspects, however, that something may be wrong with the major premise. There seem to be instances where it is not God's will that the sick should be healed. What priest does not know of many cases of devout and saintly Christians who had strong faith in the healing power of our Lord, and made use of the divinely ordained means of unction or the laying on of hands with prayer, and were not healed?

Are not Mr. Hickson and Fr. Wilson making an unwarranted assumption when they say that bodily suffering or sickness are never in accordance with the will of God? What about the pains of childbirth, of which our Lord said, "A woman when she is in travail hath sorrow," without any intimation that her suffering was contrary to the divine will? What about the pain that comes from a broken bone, or the pain in the chest that warns us of the presence of pneumonia? When one commits the sin of gluttony by eating and drinking to excess, and dyspepsia results, shall we say that such sickness was not sent by God? We might mention many similar instances of bodily suffering, and even the permanent ruin of one's health, which come as the direct effect of sins of the flesh, and can only be attributed to God. St. Paul speaks of many who are weak and sickly because of unworthy communions, "not discerning the Lord's Body." Was this sickness not in accordance with the will of God?

We cannot think of God as an absentee landlord apart

from his world and interfering with it occasionally in answer to our prayers. We believe that the laws of nature and the will of God are one and the same thing. If a man breaks his leg, it is both in accord with the laws of nature and the will of God that he should suffer pain, and that he should keep to his room for six weeks or more until the bone has grown together again. If another man depletes his strength by over-work, and tubercular microbes take possession of his lungs, it is both the law of nature and the will of God that he must rest and live out of doors and build up his strength by the right kind of food in order to get well. In both cases his recovery will be assisted and hastened by strong faith, and by keeping his soul and body in sacramental contact with our risen and ascended Lord and Saviour.

Obstacles to Preaching the Word

THERE are many well-meaning organizations, paying munificent salaries to office clerks, and displaying on their letterheads the names of eminent citizens as patrons or members of the executive committees and advisory councils, which seem to have formed a conspiracy to block the preaching of the Word of God. They bombard the clergy with letters urging them,—sometimes commanding them,—to make a stirring appeal to their congregations on the following Sunday on behalf of some special cause. Often they enclose suggestions for a special sermon on that particular subject. Not infrequently they go so far as to summon the clergy to observe a Sunday as Tuberculosis Sunday, or American Legion Sunday, or Juvenile Delinquent Sunday,—sublimely ignorant apparently of the appointed festivals and fasts of the Christian year.

For several weeks we have been collecting a file of these

letters; and therefore we may guess what has been the burden of the messages delivered by obliging clergy to long-suffering congregations during this period,—assuming of course that they have obeyed these epistolary behests. If the clergy have not obeyed, but have clung to the old-fashioned notion that they were commissioned to preach the Word of God, then the laity may learn from the following list of appeals what good things have been kept from them:

To school children to go to free dental clinics.

To contribute to the Roosevelt Memorial Association.

To attend the meetings of the Every Name Campaign.

To assist Girl Scouts in a hundred thousand dollar drive.

To enroll as members of the American Red Cross.

To "Come and See" the Y. W. C. A. during November.

On behalf of the Ideals of the American Legion.

To observe December 7th as Bible Sunday.

To feed the starving children of Armenia.

To urge people to join the Thrift Citizens Movement.

To contribute to Armenian and Syrian Relief.

To join the Better and Bigger Church School Campaign.

To present a Sunday School Pageant in place of the sermon on a special Sunday.

To observe Sunday before Advent as Temperance Sunday.

No doubt the people in these organizations are of excellent intentions and are endeavoring to do good work. Evidently, however, they have the impression that the religious work of the Church is not sufficiently absorbing to demand all of the time and energy of the clergy. If the Church is becoming simply an advertising agency and bureau of information on all sorts of subjects, it might be better to call in advertising and publicity experts to take the place of the clergy, so that the task might be performed more efficiently.

A Studio Talk

REV. J. G. H. BARRY, D.D.

OAKHURST is not the sort of a place one would pick out to live in if one were dependent upon excitement for happiness. It is a town that the tides of industry have passed by; but just on that account it is often attractive to such as are content to live simply and quietly, finding their happiness in the peaceful beauty of the hills and meadows, and in the meditations for which the works of nature best supply the substance. It is, I think, an added joy to life, — at least for those of us who have come here from the noise and rush of a city, — that no one here is in a hurry. Time does not count for much. Meals are never *at* but *about* an hour. We drop in and see one another without any feeling that possibly we are interrupting the labors of a busy man. Strangers arriving among us are no doubt worried by our habits. They fret because what they buy is not delivered until the next day; or because the dealer is just out of wood or coal and will have some “in a day or two”; they are irritated because they find the railroads are late and our mails and morning papers are not on the dot—they are like the Irishman’s train, “they do be dropping in every once in a while.” But a few weeks in Oakhurst calms even the most restless natures and develops the blessed virtue of patience. Last week I actually heard Mrs. Rogers, whose advent but six months ago set us in a turmoil, and who actually went so far as to complain that the town clock was ten minutes slow, saying quite sweetly to old Billings who sells provisions, “Oh, no, it doesn’t matter at all about sending the eggs today.” I can’t of course expect

you to appreciate to the full what a conquest that signified of atmosphere over temperament. You don't know Oakhurst, and you don't know Mrs. Rogers.

I don't mean you to infer that Oakhurst is a silent community of capitalists enjoying life far away from the clash of corporations and unions. Far from it. We are not rich and we earn our daily bread; only as we are content with daily bread, and do not clamor for all the out-of-season delicacies. We have, too, a social life; a life centering neither at the tea-table, nor the card-table, but finding its satisfaction in friendly intercourse, in spirited, and often brilliant conversation. There is a prevalent superstition that those who are outside the "centers of life" are rather dull and uninteresting even to themselves. That is certainly not so at Oakhurst. Just because we are outside the "centers" we are not swept away by movements of thought of merely passing interest. Life to us is not looking on at a procession that moves so fast that we have no time to appreciate any single feature of it. We are undisturbed by fashion and have leisure to disentangle the permanent from the transient. Perhaps we are not quite up-to-date, but that troubles us not at all.

There are certain houses where we are apt to meet from time to time knowing pretty well whom we shall find there. In especial there is one place where men gather of an evening with a certainty that they will not be bored. Eversley is an artist — a painter — who is possessed of a large and attractive studio where almost any evening, if you are late enough, you will find sympathetic company. Eversley is perhaps the one restless inhabitant of Oakhurst,—at least he has periods of restlessness. He is kept here by certain family duties which we need not go into. At times he seems to reach the end of a possible endurance of quiet, and dis-

appears for weeks or months into a world beyond our gates. But he comes back bringing with him many sketches of life, and settles down a bit to work them up. He has a fascinating personality, and when he is at home we gather about him almost nightly.

I dropped in one Sunday evening not long ago—a Sunday night in late October, when a cold wind was blowing the rain in torrents down the deserted street. The wind had swept the trees bare of the last lingering leaves and had tossed them in wet heaps upon the sidewalk. It was hardly to be expected that anyone would be out on such a night. I noticed a light still burning in the church as I came by and wondered what sort of a congregation would have gathered out on a night like this. I had a mental picture of Father Mark going through the service conscientiously and preaching, it might be, to three persons. That would be about the limit on such a night. Under the most favorable circumstances we are not much given to church-going in the evening.

Opening the door of Eversley's studio, and taking off my wet raincoat, I felt the vast contrast between without and within. The studio is long and rather narrow. The end farthest from the door is the studio proper, and was now shut off by a drawn curtain. The end in which I found myself was like a library: there were bookshelves and a table, covered with what appeared to be sketches, or designs, of some sort. There was a huge fireplace, where just now a delightful fire crackled. Before it was a sofa and half a dozen chairs. I was surprised to find three of them occupied. I was not alone in facing the wind and rain for the sake of company.

"Oh, this is fine," Eversley said. "Come up to the fire and do something to wake us up. We were all getting nicely asleep, I fancy."

"Service is just over, I suppose," the man at the far side of the fireplace said, with what was intended to be a teasing inflection. "Why didn't you bring Father Mark along?"

The speaker was Dr. Houghton, whose acquaintance with the church is confined to its exterior aspect. I doubt if he knows enough about the inside of the church to tell the altar from the organ. But that doesn't prevent him from having quite definite opinions on the subject of religion, or of entering heartily into our frequent discussions. He is clever and well educated in his profession, and we value him, among other qualities, for his settled opposition to much that to us has worth. He keeps us mentally alert by his opposition and prevents us from becoming stale from the fact of mutual agreement.

I declined to be drawn by Houghton's remark, and sat down in the chair beside Dexter, who completed the trio about the fire. Dexter is a rising young lawyer whose work is spread over the whole county. He too finds Oakhurst a convenient center from which to operate. He is rumored to have political ambitions which are backed by a number of influential men whose home is here. I was lighting my cigar and getting ready to "draw" Dexter on the political situation in the county, when a rap at the door, and an invitation to enter, was followed by the appearance of a figure familiar to us all. We got up and welcomed Father Mark.

Father Mark has for many years been the most familiar figure in Oakhurst. As he came toward the fire and was relieved by Eversley of his cloak, there was revealed a rather small, thin man, whose hands were slim and long, and whose face was deeply lined. The thin lips were closely set; and the eyes, very dark and piercing for so old a man, seized you and held you. He wore his cassock and biretta, both rather shabby, and as he turned for a mo-

ment to the warmth of the fire, and I caught but his side face, it seemed to me he wore an expression of great weariness. It well might be, for his career in Oakhurst had been for many years a fight against most tenacious opposition, and it was only in the last few years that he had become established in all hearts as the town's most loved citizen. He had come as a young man to the rectorship of our church, and had found himself in an atmosphere of conservative churchmanship, so self-satisfied and unimaginative, that it could not think of any change in the parish which would not be for the worse. I was too young then to appreciate what was going on, but I have since often heard the story of the important men and women in the parish who were quite ready to take the young rector by the hand and guide him into the peaceful and somnolent ways which his predecessor had trod. One imagines the shock that was theirs when the young priest at the proper time in the service announced that Mass would be said in the church daily at seven-thirty, and that he would be in the church on Saturday afternoons from four to six to hear confessions, or to give any desired spiritual counsel and advice. It was the beginning of a long, long fight from which Father Mark emerged with many lines in his face, but with the universal respect—no, the love, of Oakhurst.

Father Mark is a constant member of the group which meets in Eversley's studio. It is quite understood that his presence imposes no restraint on the expression of opinion. It is also understood that Father Mark will speak quite plainly from his own point of view. But we are not apt to get on controversial subjects; our conversation is the ordinary conversation of educated men; social and political questions, literature and art, with naturally from time to time philosophy and religion. Father Mark quite holds his

own on any subject, and we delight in his companionship and sharp wit.

I was rather expecting that he would allude to the weather as a preventative of church-going, because we are all members of St. Peter's with the exception of the doctor, who declares himself an agnostic. It was perhaps to forestall such remarks, also to "get a rise out of the Father," that Eversley said, "You must be chilled, Father; draw up closer to the fire. I am sorry that I cannot offer you anything internally warming; but you know we live in a cold dry world at present."

Father Mark turned from the fire with a mocking smile. "It is odd how you artists fall behind in the practical knowledge of life. I suppose we all have to pay the penalty of our qualities, and you were always a dreamer, even in the days when I used to take you on my knee and tell you medieval legends; but fancy being so deep in the intellectual backwoods as to think that alcohol warms one! I think you might have been better taught than that, don't you, doctor?"

"I really don't think I need instruction in such matters," Eversley said, without giving the doctor time to answer the appeal to him. "I am not a fool, and I can tell whether a drink warms me or not without referring to my physician. You'll get no fee from me for advice on that matter, Houghton."

"Sorry," Houghton obviously amused took it up. "But I will be charitable enough to help you without the fee, badly as I need one. I am too polite to wish to imply that you are a fool, but it is obvious that you have not yet learned to distinguish between being burned and being warmed. It is common knowledge that drinkers withstand the cold very badly."

"That is what I call pretty hard luck, to have you two combine against me." Eversley tried to pass it off; but then turning to the doctor he broke out, "You have a gall, Houghton, to go back on me in that way. You haven't become an abstainer, have you?"

"No, I haven't become an abstainer; I drink in moderation, as the phrase is; but I do not tell myself lies about it. I drink, not because it warms me, or makes me cheerful, or helps in my work, but purely because I like the taste of certain kinds of drink. I drink with my eyes open to the consequences, and prepared to take them."

"You admit then that there are consequences," I said, wishing to help on what promised to be an interesting discussion. "Do you mean that you are the worse for the moderate amount of alcohol that you drink?"

"Yes, I suppose I *am* the worse, as you put it. If a large dose of alcohol has a manifestly deleterious effect, a small dose must have *some* effect. I took, for example, a small dose of alcohol with my dinner this evening. If I were to repeat that same dose several times this evening, I should feel the effect; if I repeated it often enough I should be drunk."

"That is quite a different theory from the one in which I was brought up," Dexter said. "I never paid much attention to the question, but I remember being taught in college that alcohol is a food. Do you mean to say, Houghton, that that is not true?"

"That is precisely what I mean. It is of the essence of science to be progressive. The Father here," Houghton went on with a twinkle in his eyes, "can go on repeating a creed which is so old he is not quite sure when it originated; but it is not safe to repeat scientific creeds three years old without verifying them. I, too, learned in college that alco-

hol is food, but that view has been abandoned for some time. The most recent investigations, those conducted by the Carnegie Nutrition Laboratory, prove, what was indeed known before, that alcohol is always a narcotic poison, no matter in how small quantities taken."

"And yet, as I understand you," Dexter pressed him, "you deliberately take into your system day by day a dose of narcotic poison. Would you mind telling us how you justify that?"

"Not at all," Houghton returned. "As I said, I do it because I like it, and I am willing to pay the penalty. I recognize that with care the penalty will not be very great; and as I have no children it will not be handed on. There is a danger no doubt that the habit will grow, that I shall be tempted to increase my amount; but I am not worrying about that. I do not think such drinking affects my value, such as it is, as a member of the community, and of the medical profession; and beyond that I am not interested. I am not aiming like Eversley here at the ideal life."

"Well," said Dexter, "this is quite a new line of thought for me. I have myself never been attached to the flowing bowl, but I like a cocktail before dinner, and don't object to a glass of wine with my dinner; it aids digestion." And then, noticing the touch of amusement in Houghton's eyes, Dexter went on, "Are you going to deny that alcohol *does* aid digestion? That certainly would contradict the whole experience of the human race."

"Hardly that," Houghton took it up. "What such a denial would do is to contradict the human race's interpretation of its experience, which is quite a different thing. What really happens is that the poisonous effects of alcohol on the mucous membrane produces a temporary abnormal supply of digestive juices, giving the impression that diges-

tion is being aided. But the illusion is not reality; the reality is that digestion is retarded, not accelerated; injured, not aided; notwithstanding what you think about it. But I don't want to bore you with shop talk."

"No, don't stop," Eversley joined in; "let's get all the light we can on this matter while we are at it. If we have to stop drinking under legal pressure, it is a good thing to know why. I confess to having a pretty good stock laid away for dry times, but if I am just poisoning myself by the use of it, I want to know it. I am not like you, devoted to the taste of liquor, or wine; I seldom drink except when I go out to dinner, or give a dinner; that is, I drink for the sociability of it. You certainly won't deny that a cocktail or a glass of wine wakens a dinner up and sets the tongues going. I was at a dinner last week where the hostess declined to serve wine because of the present law, and we were all very glum."

"I am afraid," Houghton took it up, "that the scientific analysis of the phenomena would not be altogether favorable to securing inspiration in the flowing bowl; if you will insist on this scientific view it is something like this. The effect of alcohol is to paralyze the centers of inhibition and control, and leave the emotions uncontrolled, thus exalting them above the higher faculties. Moreover, the moral and spiritual emotions do not partake of this exhilaration, but are dulled from the start. The real account of the sociability you seek is irresponsibility. That is obvious from the results when you push alcoholic indulgence a little beyond the limit."

During all this discussion Father Mark had sat with his eyes fixed on the fire, as though quite without interest in what was going on. As I knew him to be a strong, not to say violent, advocate of prohibition, I wondered at this. He

was perhaps so tired that he had been oblivious to our talk. I was a little startled therefore when he came abruptly into our conversation.

"Do you mean to say, Eversley, that when you go out to a dinner you deliberately get drunk, in the expectation that your alcoholic ravings will be mistaken for brilliant conversation? That is really astounding. It seems to me, though I am not a society person, that I would much rather be dull than be drunk."

"That is terribly unfair, Father Mark," Eversley protested; "nobody said anything about being drunk. It is only a question of one's being stimulated, to be at one's best conversationally."

"Well, there is no need to quarrel about the word," Father Mark answered. "For drunk, let us substitute, *under the influence of liquor*. I still don't see why I should put myself under the influence of liquor in order to produce the illusion that I am brilliant. That seems to me to be a fraudulent proceeding. What would be your judgment of me, if you were to discover that I slipped into the sacristy each Sunday before my sermon and took a cocktail? Would you regard it as an adequate explanation of that proceeding that I wish to appear brilliant in the pulpit?"

"You are impossible, Father Mark." Eversley was obviously rather nettled at the sharpness of the criticism. "I don't get drunk, whatever Houghton's science may think about it; and it is desirable to be enteraining when you go out to dinner."

"Why not be a Christian?" Father Mark asked. "They have always been entertaining. They were butchered to make a Roman holiday, you remember, and I am sure that Roman populace was entertained by the living torches that lighted Nero's garden. And today I am sure a great many

Christians drink cocktails at dinner to afford entertainment for the guests who would think them narrow-minded and bigoted if they didn't. But certainly I would much rather entertain an American dinner party after the primitive Christian manner than by getting drunk for their amusement."

"My experience is," Eversley retorted, "that society does not find Christians entertaining. I mean that it does not find them entertaining as Christians. If they consent to drop their religion for the time, to act as other people, they may be acceptable enough. And commonly they do, even to the extent of getting drunk, as you call it. Father, seriously, I confess that I am very much disturbed by this whole matter of prohibition. We are urged as Christians to give up wine, but our Lord turned water into wine."

"I have been waiting for that inevitable citation," Father Mark took it up. "Without implying any criticism of you, Eversley, it is interesting to note that it has been sought to prop most abuses in this world by the authority of our Lord, or the Bible, or religion in general. Tyrannies of the most opposite kind are so propped. Once it was the divine right of kings which was upheld by Biblical authority. At present our Lord is held up to us as the first true democrat,—if not indeed the first socialist. All sorts of bad science have taken refuge in the supposed authority of the Bible, and whole provinces of knowledge have been hindered in their expression by the quotation of geological, biological, astronomical data alleged to have the authority of the inspired Scriptures. I can almost remember when the platforms and pulpits of a large part of this country were defending slavery with the same sort of Biblical ammunition. We now see perfectly that all these appeals to Biblical authority were utterly mistaken; but we keep on in the same

line, and now it is attempted to bolster up the liquor traffic by the miracle of Cana, and by some advice of St. Paul which indicates that his sympathy was better than his physiology."

"But still, Father," Eversley insisted, "I don't see the fallacy. If our Lord made wine, how can it be bad?"

"There you put your finger on the fallacy," Father Mark replied. "No one, that is no one in his right mind, would contend that wine is *bad*, i. e. wicked. The contention of the opponents of the liquor traffic is that a social situation has arisen in which it is perceived that the effects of alcohol are in every way disastrous. The aim of the opponents of alcohol is to put an end to the physical, social, moral diseases which alcohol has produced. They find that in practice this cannot be done except by elimination of alcohol as a beverage. They therefore insist on this elimination. They do not assert that alcohol is wicked; they do assert that the extent to which it is used today results in widespread disaster."

"And therefore," Dexter came in, "the advocate of prohibition would force on the community a course of action which is destructive of personal liberty. I confess that to me that is the real difficulty of the whole question. I can see of course that the United States would be much better off if it were sober, but I doubt whether we are not paying too high a price for even so great a boon when we pay with the sacrifice of the liberty of the individual."

"My dear fellow," Father Mark answered, "the personal liberty of the individual in the sense in which you are using the words, i. e., his right to do as he pleases, without reference to the results of his acts, was necessarily given up when first two people undertook to live together. As a matter of fact there is no such right as you assert."

"I do not mean," Dexter answered, "the right to do as one pleases, but the right to act as I choose so long as my action does not injure others."

"But if that is what you mean," Father Mark replied, "yon concede the whole case. We who believe in prohibition assert that your action in the use of alcohol *does* injure others. It injures you to start with, as Dr. Houghton has shown. Dr. Houghton, by the way, is a very good illustration of the matter in hand. He is an individual anarchist who claims the liberty to injure himself by alcoholic indulgence if he so wills. That is bad science, bad sociology, bad morals. But he has not only himself to think of; he is bound to think of the good of society of which he is a member. That society has a right to demand of him that he give it his best. He confessedly runs the risk of not giving it his best if, for example, he is called from his alcoholized dinner to a case requiring a very difficult diagnosis. A human life may depend upon his judgment, and the judgment he has to offer is that of a more or less muddled brain."

"Liberty," the Father went on, "is perhaps the word that has been employed with the most distasteful results of any word in the whole human vocabulary. There can be no such thing as an unlimited freedom of action in any society. Society to exist at all must be superior to the individual; and its conceded right is to call on him for any sacrifice it thinks necessary. It can call for his life, or his property; and if it can rightly demand these fundamental things, it may surely demand minor sacrifices such as the abandonment of indulgence in certain sorts of drink, if it feels that it is to its best interest. In the face of this obvious right of the community it is futile to set up a doctrine of personal liberty."

"And more than that, Dexter, you are not only a member

of a democratic community in which the voice of the majority is law; but you are a member of a Church of which one of the fundamental laws is, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.' This is a far-reaching law, and one of immense difficulty of application because of our deep-rooted selfishness. But it is the law of the Christian life. You are not, from the point of view of either the state or the Church, an isolated unit, irresponsible in your conduct, privileged to go your own way and live your own life. You are responsible to God and man for the effect of your conduct on yourself and on society. You cannot rightly say, 'I drink so little that I am not injured by it.' Let us admit—though I don't admit—that that is true, and still that is not at all the end of the matter. By your action you are allying yourself with corrupt interests, and throwing the influence of your example on the side of evil. You associate yourself with that part of society which upholds all the evils involved in the traffic of alcohol. I am going to speak with the utmost plainness, my dear fellow, and I know you will understand my motive. The strength of the forces of evil does not lie in the saloon, or in the frequenters of the saloon; it lies in the selfishness of good men and women, who, for the sake of personal pleasure are upholding the greatest curse the world has ever seen. The man who 'likes a glass of wine with his dinner,' and who, like Eversley, has to get moderately drunk in order to overcome his habitual gloom and make himself cheerful and talkative, has sold his independence, and for very consistency's sake must oppose prohibition. Verily, he more than most others, is guilty concerning his brother."

"Really, Father," Dexter said, "if I am convicted as the supporter of so many iniquities by the fact that I have wine for dinner, and occasionally take a cocktail or glass of beer,

I am quite ready to give up such bad habits. Now, I am ashamed to say that I never paid much attention to the arguments for prohibition, having assumed, it seems quite gratuitously, that the advocates of prohibition are a set of fanatics trying to impose their opinions on the community. In fact I am still rather vague as to what the great abuses of alcohol are, aside from the obvious one of drunkenness."

"I should like to inject an argument on the other side," Houghton said smilingly. "There are not only evils of alcohol, but evils of prohibition. I was dining the other evening with a lady from the South who expressed herself very strongly in this matter. The most distressing situation, she said, was arriving. She really did not know what they were going to do in their state if the prohibition law was enforced. It was alleged that it would empty the jails and prisons, and in her state they had been depending upon prison labor to make their roads,—and what were they going to do about roads?"*

When we had recovered from the effects of Houghton's anecdote, Dexter returned to his point, — "What are effects of alcohol that it is intending doing away with; and is sufficient provision made for its proper use?"

"It has," Father Mark said, "a certain use of course in manufactures, but apart from that it would be difficult to say what its 'use' is."

"There is surely a medical use," Dexter insisted; "that I suppose is left."

"Houghton is a better authority on such matters than I am," the Father said. "What can you tell us?"

"Why," Houghton replied, "Dr. C. H. Mayo, than whom I suppose there is no better authority, said in his address before the American Medical Association in New York in

* Fact.

1917, that medicine has reached a period when alcohol is rarely used as a drug, being displaced by better remedies. Alcohol's only place now is in the arts and sciences. He said that national prohibition would be welcomed by the medical profession. That, perhaps, is a little optimistic."

"And furthermore," Houghton went on, "the convention which represented many thousands of the leading physicians of the country, resolved to exclude alcohol from the pharmacopœia, the book published by its authority containing the formularies and methods for the preparation of medicines for the use of druggists."

"That would seem adequately to dispose of that side of the subject," Father Mark said, "but there remains the effect that you were questioning about, Dexter."

"Of course you will easily understand that the effects are so complicated that they can only be approximately set out in figures. But if the statistics furnished by the experts are even approximately correct, they present an appalling state of affairs. You will find them given in Stelzle's 'Why Prohibition,' a book, by the way, which everyone ought to read. So far as I can remember the figures they are something like this. Alcohol is responsible for 10 per cent of the divorces, 25 per cent of poverty, 25 per cent of insanity, 37 per cent of pauperism, 45 per cent of the desertions, and 50 per cent of the crimes of this country; and this is a very conservative statement. I myself in all my long ministry have never known half a dozen cases of real poverty which had not an alcoholic element. I submit that in the face of such facts it sounds incredibly trivial and selfish to hear a man opposing prohibition on the ground that it will interfere with personal liberty."

"Right you are, Father," Eversley said. "But I suppose that I will have to get used to being dull and stupid at din-

ners. It won't make so much difference if everyone else is stupid."

Father Mark wrapped himself up in his long cloak and went out into the storm. The rest of us sat a while about the cheerful fire, talking over Father Mark and his opinions. Our conclusion was that the case for prohibition was unanswerable. "There are many other aspects of the subject beside this upon which we have touched," Dr. Houghton said, "but I do not think they need cause any modification of the prohibition program. I thoroughly agree with all that Father Mark said, and I presume that I shall become a total abstainer — when my private stock is exhausted."

Further Observations on the General Convention

REV. CHARLES HERBERT YOUNG.

THE meeting of the General Convention or any gathering of the Church's leaders to take counsel upon the affairs of the Church and possibly to enact legislation which may completely change the plans and methods of her work fills thoughtful minds with hope and often with anxiety. To entrust matters which bear upon the very life of the Church to the consideration of a motley group of some six hundred priests and laymen, many of whom are as innocent as babes of the subjects brought before them, is to take no little risk. But we have our Saviour's promise of the guidance of the Holy Spirit and as we watch the progress of the Church in her Conventions we feel certain that He has been present and that men have yielded themselves to His direction. When we consider the material

God has to use we ought not to complain about the results which are achieved.

The General Convention which has just closed its session in Detroit was marked by a desire to understand the needs of the world in these days of reconstruction and to make it possible for the Church to do her full share in meeting these needs. There was a strong spirit of harmony and good fellowship with a desire to understand each other's point of view. Most of the deputies were there for business and had but little patience with the regular speakers or the new members who felt impelled to deliver themselves of carefully prepared orations, or the tiresome objectors who seemed to feel that forward-looking legislation might lead the Church upon the rocks. One hesitates to speak evil of dignitaries, but we will not be misunderstood when we say that with the exception of a small group of well-meaning but Van Winklian deputies, the mind of the Convention was turned definitely towards the front.

The Church has cast aside the swaddling bands of her early years and has made a complete reorganization of her machinery which will make it possible for her to keep at work all the time between the sessions of the Convention. The new canon 58, which is the result of many months of careful work by thoughtful men, replaces the old Board of Missions, the General Board of Religious Education and the Joint Commission on Social Service by a group known as the "Presiding Bishop and Council." Until such time as the presiding bishop of the Church shall be elected the chairman of this council shall be a bishop elected by the House of Bishops and approved by the House of Deputies. The members of the council are four bishops, four priests and eight laymen, elected by the General Convention, and one representative from each of the eight Provinces. The

presiding bishop and his council shall exercise all the powers of the domestic and foreign missionary society and shall have charge of the unification, development and prosecution of missions, education and social service and such work as the General Convention may commit to it. They also have power to initiate and develop between the sessions of the Convention such new work as they may deem necessary, subject to the constitution and canons of the Church. This statesmanlike organization under the leadership of a wise presiding bishop ought to mark the beginning of a strong, well-regulated new life in the Church.

The revised canon on ordination brings the requirements of the preparation for the sacred ministry up to the modern standards of scholarship. The normal requirements are in full keeping with the ideals of the Church. The choice of a wide range of electives makes it possible for a man to specialize in those branches in which he is especially interested. A new and valuable feature of the canon establishes a minimum standard for men of mature years and for men who have already attained success in some special field of lay work who wish to be ordained. A man who has a special talent for a particular type of work but who has not the intellectual training necessary to meet the normal standard may be ordained for this special work, but he may not be transferred to another diocese without the consent of the bishop until such time as he has brought his standard up to the normal. The passage of this canon will be of the greatest benefit to the Church, for it will make it possible for bishops to secure the services of men for special types of work (e. g., the slums, rural, mountain, mining, etc.) who would have been debarred under the old requirements for ordination.

The Joint Commission on the Revision of the Prayer

Book presented a carefully prepared report which awakened great hopes in the minds of those who longed to see the Church claim more fully her catholic heritage; but the time of the Convention was so fully occupied with other matters that there was no opportunity to do more with the Prayer Book than to ratify the changes made in the Choir Offices and special Prayers and Thanksgivings three years ago. The House of Deputies did make some valuable alterations in the Burial Office but the bishops were unable to give time to their consideration. Prayers for the departed (which used to be the cause of fervid oratory) were adopted almost unanimously. If there is as great progress in the mind of the Church during the next three years as in the past three, and if the Joint Commission's next report is as deserving of our confidence as this one, we may look forward to having a Book of Worship which will measure up well with the best traditions of the Church.

By far the most absorbing subject in the Convention was the Nation-wide Campaign. Bishops and deputies were filled with it. At every session its power was felt as it gathered more momentum. The joint session to consider the Campaign was looked forward to with keen anticipation. The galleries and the extra space on the floor were filled with eager visitors, many of whom had been members of mission study classes of the Woman's Auxiliary and the General Board of Religious Education and who came praying earnestly for the guidance of the Holy Spirit in the meeting. The very atmosphere seemed electrified. The feeling became more and more intense as the speakers portrayed the vision of the awakened Church going forward in her strength to win the world for Christ. The climax came when the chairman in a ringing speech challenged the Convention to meet the call of God through the Church

and go forward to conquer. As he concluded the whole assembly dropped upon their knees and together said the General Confession from the Communion Office and asked God's help to do His will. Seldom, if ever, has such a scene been witnessed in this Church.

Much anxiety and distrust has been felt throughout the Church over the so-called Concordat lest the Church betray her sacred trust. Under the rules adopted by the House of Deputies the time for discussion was too limited. There was scarcely opportunity to lay before the House carefully and fully all that was involved in the proposition. There was evidently a desire to treat the subject fairly and to show the world that when the Church set forth the Quadri-lateral it was in earnest. For the first time since that famous document was issued a group of men has come accepting its four propositions in good faith and asking what further consideration the Church will require before they may be ordained. After most anxious and prayerful thought a representative committee of the House of Deputies brought in a report which was modified somewhat by the bishops, appointing a joint commission of bishops, priests and laymen to continue the discussion with the Congregationalists and instructing the commission to carefully conserve certain definite points, particularly that the congregation for whom the priest is ordained shall define its purpose to receive in future the ministry and Sacraments of one who shall have been ordained to the priesthood; that the priest shall in celebrating the Holy Communion incorporate in a prayer of Consecration the words of our Lord, a suitable oblation and the Invocation of the Holy Spirit; that he shall in no case administer the Holy Communion to an unbaptized person; and that this Church hopes that the practice of Confirmation shall be adopted. This commission has

entrusted to it a matter of vital importance as it bears upon the unity of the Body of Christ. They will need the earnest prayers of all men that they and those with whom they confer may see the Faith as God reveals it and act entirely in harmony with His will. Three years must elapse before any further action may be taken. The question is before the Church, and must be discussed frankly and freely upon its merits.

An event of unusual interest which was not on the program as originally prepared, but which marked an epoch in the life of the Church, was the visit of Cardinal Mercier to the House of Deputies. Learning of his expected presence in the city, the House extended to him an invitation to come and be its guest. The Cardinal accepted and was received with an ovation which must have convinced him that Dr. Mann meant what he said when in his words of welcome he told him that we greeted him from the bottom of our hearts as a patriot, a great churchman and as a man whom all could love. The Cardinal's words to the Convention were simple and sincere as he described the spirit which lay back of Germany's awful fall into a godless philosophy which made it possible for her to perpetrate horrors which will leave a black mark upon her name throughout history.

The good fellowship of the Convention and its earnest spirit were helped by the many outside meetings. The great convention of the Brotherhood of St. Andrew had just closed, leaving an atmosphere of deep consecration. The Auxiliary with its splendid groups of devoted women; the Social Service Forum with its earnest (even if radical) speakers; the educational exhibits with inspiring classes of eager men and women; the Seamen's Church Institute with its interesting history; the Girls' Friendly Society; the

Daughters of the King; and other groups—all contributed their share and helped to make it possible for the Convention to keep a high plane. A very quiet but most important group was that which gathered about Mr. James Moore Hickson, who carried on a healing mission in Christ Church during the latter part of the Convention. Mr. Hickson met and addressed the clergy of the Convention on one evening and the laymen at another time. Besides this he gave unstintedly of his time to private conferences and in every way possible he helped make clear his great purpose to assist the Church in restoring her work of spiritual healing. He created a profound impression and many men went home determined under God to try to be more faithful in their ministry to the sick both in mind and body.

Some Recent Spiritualistic Literature

REV. FRANK H. HALLOCK, D.D.

Crawford, W. J. Hints and Observations for Those Investigating the Phenomena of Spiritualism. New York, 1918.

Herbine, Charlotte G. The Meeting of the Spheres or Letters from Dr. Coulter. New York, 1919.

Hill, J. Arthur. Spiritualism: Its History, Phenomena and Doctrine, with an Introduction by Sir Arthur Conan Doyle. New York, 1919.

Martin, Alfred W. Psychic Tendencies of Today. New York, 1918.

"Sciens." How to Speak With the Dead. New York, 1918.

Watson, Albert D. The Twentieth Plane, A Psychic Revelation. Philadelphia, 1919.

Forster, Arthur Haire. Four Modern Religious Movements. Boston, 1919.

IN the present-day popularity of spiritualism one may find many evidences of good. It indicates a reaction from previous misconceptions: from materialism, from the over-emphasis upon religion as a matter primarily of

this world, from the current tendency to make religion merely a code of ethics. As Mr. Martin says,—associating Spiritualism with Christian Science, Theosophy and New Thought,—“each of these movements arose to stem the tide of skepticism, to check the growth of philosophical materialism and of that practical materialism which is far more dangerous than any erroneous speculations of the philosophers; the materialism, whose gospel is creature-comforts, sensualism, and starvation of the spirit; life self-centered and unconsecrated” (p. 22). Spiritualism bears witness to the hunger for immortality which naturalism and the conceptions just noted have forced into the background. We may rejoice in the increasing interest in the supernatural—even though it is not the highest form of the supernatural with which spiritualism concerns itself; for a supernatural that does not begin with God can never be an adequate, satisfying supernatural. Spiritualism is also a reaction from our failure, in practice, to make use of the doctrines of the Intermediate State of the Communion of Saints, and of the possibility of our communication with the departed through the medium of prayer. In the case of those who have never grasped any positive idea of the larger life beyond and, by their failure, have done violence to a fundamental craving of their nature, there is a longing for some communication with the departed, for some assurance of their survival, with which it is easy and natural for us to sympathize. A study of some of the more recent writings does not, however, deepen this *a priori* sympathy which we may instinctively feel. The alleged communications may in some cases appeal to our emotions, but they leave our reason untouched—unless it be moved to reject them.

We should make it clear that Spiritualism is not a form

of Christianity in any orthodox acceptation of the term. Mr. Hill (p. 180) asserts that it is: "it is a form of Christianity; though some of its adherents prefer not to say this, because by 'Christianity' they mean an ecclesiastical and creedal system which, not without reason, they regard as not necessarily good or representative of the mind of Christ." But in the Spiritualistic service which Mr. Hill reports (pp. 184 sqq.) God is mentioned only once and the Holy Spirit once, and the service is concerned so largely with communications from the departed that one may regard the receiving of such communications as the chief purpose of the meeting; certainly it is not prayer, praise, thanksgiving or worship. In spite of this evidence Mr. Hill is insistent; he continues (p. 215): "It is not a worship of spirits. . . . Neither is it merely communication with spirits. As already stated, its first principle is the fatherhood of God, and this is a religious principle." This may be so, but it is a principle of which they apparently make small use. To the reader who examines the subject from without, the religious side seems narrowed down to the one subject of communications; which concerned with the supernatural, it does not at all act as though it were in the presence of the supernatural; "the human or secular element is rather strongly present in the atmosphere of their meetings. The good people are friendly and chatty, but a moderately orthodox stranger would probably feel that the devotional element is rather small. The proceedings are interesting—except when a speaker is long-winded and platitudinous—and everyone is affable; but there is a lack of dignity and reverence" (ibid, p. 219). One may hesitate to accept the rather airily-given conclusion: "And anyhow it is perhaps better than the other extreme, which often becomes mere dead ceremonialism." Whatever else it may

be, it is not Christianity. Mr. Martin would have the orthodox generally in agreement with him when he says: "In passing it may be permitted me to remark that not only did the Ethical movement originate in 1876, but its birth was due to the self-same cause that brought these psychic movements into existence, viz., the deeply-felt need of a satisfying religion to take the place of the Judaism and Christianity that had failed to make a satisfying appeal" (p. 23). Its ultimate fate is sealed in the fact that it does not minister to the fundamental instinct of worship.

Since Mr. Hill has introduced the subject of orthodoxy, let us look into that aspect next. The "Catechism" for the instruction of children contains, we may note, phrases from Tom Paine as illustrative. The evidence for survival is compared to the Apostolic reception of the Resurrection on the evidence given: "If then it was right for them to believe on the basis of things perceived by their senses—the material and phantasmal appearance of Jesus after His death,—it is difficult to see how it is wrong for people nowadays to base their belief on similarly objective evidence" (Hill, p. 251). In none of the books examined do we find any satisfactory teaching concerning the hideousness of sin. On the contrary, we find a very low view of its nature and consequences. Dr. Crawford is a little more definite than most, though in his communication we find only a sentence: "the entities" (communicating spirits) "say that in their state of existence there are in reality 'dark' places—places which should be avoided at all cost, the way to avoid them, so we are told, being to live a normal life while on earth" (p. 21). "Normal life" is not more strictly defined, and we cannot but wonder if it means a sin-free life. Comforting, if we can accept it, is the "truth" communicated to Basil King (Cosmopolitan Magazine, August,

1919), when the spirit asserts, "Emphasis is never laid upon the past, always upon the future." In its conception of God it is pantheistic throughout; thus S. T. Coleridge, speaking from the exalted twentieth plane, says: "Re God: Get this for your plane—the Universe (based on principles so well enunciated by Spinoza, later thought extending the idea into the domain of pure Kantian reason), specifically, as an utterance of fact without the most minute grain of dissimulation, teaches that The Universe is God. Now, this is our first premise. We of the Twentieth Plane know, based on extensive empirical thought-endeavours in the chambers of concentration, that God, the Universe, is really one great all-comprehensive, omniscient, omnipresent soul-mind, divided into three great divisional strata. These are: (1) The passive physical world, (2) The great area of imagination (and at the apex), (3) The serene, rare, pure inspirational centre of God's intelligence" (Dr. Watson, pp. 235-235). Hartley Coleridge, being asked whether "It is necessary to have a theory of God in order to understand the world?", replies: "No; because you are a part of God" (ibid, p. 241). Ingersoll bears his evidence to the same effect (ibid, p. 283). Spinoza (pp. 187-189) reaffirms the teaching that he delivered while on earth. Dr. Coulter, in his communications, often tells us the same, e. g., "Fruits and flowers are the things which help us, through their colour and perfume, which are part of God's spirit" (p. 43). "There is no supernatural, since all is natural, all is Nature" (p. 167). "We are the universe; we represent God, we are a demonstration from God" (p. 282). This is made clearer by a communication on the next page: "The idea of God has been changed to meet the minds of the people and of the popes and priests of different ages. Though each man may thus make his own God, the God of

the universe remains the impersonal-personal God." Numerous other references to the same effect might be given from both of these books. Pantheism is also clearly expressed in Mrs. Cameron's work (especially p. 105); though in this last smaller stress is laid upon subjects of this sort and, as a book, it is the most readable of all. Dr. Watson's book, we may note, introduces us to good company, the book bears a commendation from Abraham Lincoln and S. T. Coleridge, and the publication committee consists of Ralph Waldo Emerson, Walt Whitman, and Robert G. Ingersoll; a casual glance through the index impresses us with the fact that few of the notables in any field have refrained from the opportunity afforded them of here communicating with the world they have left. Dr. Coulter's communications generally are long, rather tiresome, pious platitudes.

Returning to the relations of these communications to orthodoxy generally; little is said of Christ, comparatively speaking, and for this we may be grateful. Dr. Watson, with less good taste than Sir Oliver Lodge has shown, gives a number of communications from Christ, one conveyed through Shelley and five given by our Lord in person (pp. 293-297). Dr. Coulter tells us some new things about our Lord's earthly life: "Jesus sought knowledge in many countries, notably by his talks with Indian philosophers, and priests in Persia and India. Read your Bibles—you have it all before you" (p. 300). Keats tells us that Dornier's theory of a Progressive Incarnation has not, even yet, reached its goal, for our Lord is still developing (Dr. Watson, pp. 287-288). Mr. Hill (pp. 301-305) is uncertain as to how He should be regarded in His relation to humanity generally. Very slight reference is made to the Third Person of the Blessed Trinity. Dr. Coulter, in discussing the

significance of numbers and their application to sacred things, speaks of the lack of uniqueness in Christian Trinitarian doctrine.

In general the communications are in harmony with the spirit of the age, as they are undogmatic. Dr. Coulter advises us: "Do away with creeds, dogmas, 'isms'" (p. 10); which we must necessarily heed if we are to accept the communications as genuine. Among the usually accepted beliefs here rejected is that in the existence of a personal devil; Sir Walter Scott ("he repudiated the title, 'Sir'"), being questioned as to whether there was a personal devil, replied: "Oh, no; you know better. Evil is misdirected energy" (Dr. Watson, p. 280). Voltaire is still a spirit in revolt, a Bolshevik of another plane, for he says: "I want to say even now, I would crush all churches, governments, all material laws, burn up everything on the fifth plane but books, wash all into the ocean, let such slum dissolve there, and pray God to build a new world" (Dr. Watson, p. 112). If conditions on the fifth plane are so unsatisfactory, one is inclined to ask "To what?" when Coleridge says: "What I want to impress is that we are striving to help, not only you, but the masses of your plane" (ibid, p. 120).

It is, of course, in connection with the Last Things that we should expect the clearest expressions, but here, too, there is nothing novel, nothing which Christianity has not long since either assimilated or rejected. The limitations of their revelations are closely restricted, they "can report to us anything in the way of their personal emotional states but they cannot tell us anything very satisfactory about the composition of their world. They can tell us if they are happy or sad, gay or gloomy, energetic or indolent; they can say if they are pleased with their surroundings or otherwise, if they would like to return to the earth, and so

on, but they cannot tell us in a convincing way if their world contains what we know here as mountains and seas" (Dr. Crawford, p. 7). "Raymond," we may note, does attempt to grapple with this difficulty. Re-incarnation is generally taught; Dr. Coulter in one of the unconsciously brighter passages of his book, tells how the discarnate spirits await the opportunity of return in a desirable body: "The middle classes afford such good opportunities that they are watched closely and snapped up quickly. And then, births are decreasing at such a rapid rate that I really don't know what we are going to do" (p. 63); so race suicide has effects in a wider realm than we had imagined and we suffer more because of it, for this particular man awaiting re-incarnation had been a learner in the spirit world for three thousand years, and Dr. Coulter assures us that "he would be a great power for good." Still not all of us are re-incarnations: "Is very child born on earth a re-incarnation? No. Some are first results of protoplasm drawn from some plane above the fifth" (Dr. Watson, p. 279). Some interesting light is thrown on previous re-incarnations; Spinoza entered this life again in the person of Disraeli, and, more astonishing still, Moses in that of Abraham Lincoln (Dr. Watson, pp. 188, 223). Still, in Mrs. Cameron's report, there are said to be no re-incarnations. Spiritualism appears as inconsistent on the subject as was Madame Blavatsky.

As to the nature of the psychic body, Dr. Crawford gives a rather full enumeration of his findings: "(1) It is perfectly invisible to normal sight, though it may occasionally be made visible to clairvoyant sight. (2) It is quite impalpable to normal senses generally. (3) It is used as part of the mechanism for producing physical phenomena. (4) Physical matter prevents no barrier to its passage through

space. (5) It is of such a nature that when united to the physical body in a living person it is an exact duplicate of the physical body. It would appear that each cell or even atom of the physical body has somehow imbedded in it, or superimposed on it, or connected with it, a corresponding element of the psychic body. (6) Its composition is not material in the sense that we know matter. (7) It would seem to radiate all around it an aura. There are signs of two distant (distinct?) auras round the body of a man, and it is possible that one is due to the physical and the other to the psychical body. (8) It would appear to be the form or mould upon which the physical body is organized; it being therefore the permanent part of us while the physical is the evanescent" (pp. 11-13).

Dr. Crawford gives us no unfair picture of what we might conceive Purgatory to be: "The operators say that their psychic bodies are incapable of being ill or feeling pain, but,—and it is an important but,—they emphatically declare that mental pain can be felt and endured in their world. In other words, they have no physical ailments, but remorse, anxiety, and mental distress of various kinds still find a place with them. The other state of existence would appear to be no heaven and no hell, and the sooner this is recognized the better. Judging by what the operators tell us, it is a world just a little higher than our own as regards the moral status of its inhabitants" (pp. 17-19). "It is rather a shock to us when we find the inhabitants of that other state not to be angels by any manner of means, not to exceed us appreciably in intelligence, but to be, in fact, only good-natured beings of much the same capacity as our familiar selves" (pp. 8-9). There is here the usual disregard of sin as a defilement of which we are to be cleansed in the intermediate state, to which we must think of these alleged psychic bodies as belonging.

Universalism is taught: "There is no hell as you sometimes picture it on earth. But we have planets peopled by men and women who have been fiends in their physical lives. There people may have to live, shut off from light and love until, by centuries of hard work, their spirits have lived out each human injustice which they committed" (Coulter, p. 187). This last passage, along with the next, we may note, is among the most definite as to any future punishment. "Very few know why they do wrong; they have had no real pleasure in doing wrong and certainly no benefit. The Hell of conscience is quite sufficient to keep most of us awake to our shortcomings. They may escape its pangs in the physical world, but there is no escape in the spiritual, where everything becomes intensified, either sorrow or joy, and we are forced to see ourselves, and we know that others see us and know us, for what we truly are; the vital question is ever the same, If a man die, does he live? He does, and in every fibre of his being. There are no closed doors; he sees and is seen by all" (Dr. Coulter, p. 163). We have nothing new here, but would that all spirits had borne as definite testimony to the continuing effects of evil done in this life! Less happy is what Dr. Coulter has to say (p. 52) about the immediate, or almost immediate, admission to the Beatific Vision; but (p. 67) this is explained not as seeing God, but feeling Him "in the divine reflex and infinite knowledge more than in personality."

As to the nature of the resurrection body Dr. Coulter tells us of the experience of another spirit: "I noticed the lightness of my own body.—My new body was of a rather solid substance not unlike flesh." Plato gives us a testimony valuable in these days when we are apt to overstress the statement that heaven is not a place, mindless of the fact that bodies, even resurrection bodies, must occupy

space and consequently be *in loco*; Plato has advanced to the hundredth plane, but for the purpose of communicating knowledge descends to the twentieth; being asked about the relation the planes bear to one another, he replies: "The hundredth plane is simply a figure of speech. To say a plane is higher than another is a weak metaphor, but to say that beings must occupy space and that there is distance between objects is logical" (Dr. Watson, p. 266). Regarding angels, "Abe"—so Lincoln is named—tells us that they are "the better angels of your own nature"; somewhat more definitely they are described as the "discarnate souls you correspond with" (Dr. Watson, p. 279). In Dr. Coulter's communications, "guides" are said to hold a position somewhat analogous to that of guardian angels (pp. 68-69). In general we find a reaction—far more widely apparent than in Spiritualism alone—to Calvinistic conceptions of the future which charted every detail, especially of the condition of the lost, in a fashion that the mind of man could never accept until he surrendered his belief in a God of love.

It would be impossible here to enter into the various explanatory theories which are given; traditionally there are two, fraud or diabolic activity; Mr. Hill examines the latter, which he terms the "Roman Catholic" (pp. 231-237). In recent days we have added to these the newer psychological explanation of telepathy or thought transference. The first of these explanations must today be regarded as wholly inadequate; we must concede the reality of many of the experiences recorded, though the presence of fraud is always a possibility to be reckoned with. In addition to conscious fraud we have to allow for unintentional self-deception; the phenomena which Dr. Crawford regards as convincing evidence (pp. 67-68) could be quite satisfac-

torily explained as due to mere nervousness; the passage is too long for quotation, but, more briefly and to the same effect, he says (p. 77): "If a cold breeze is felt playing about the hands it may be taken as a certain sign that psychic action is under way. The fingers of some of the circle may also become cold and some may experience a cobwebby sensation about the face, which are also signs of psychic action." Probably everyone has experienced sensations of this sort under a variety of circumstances, and they might be anticipated by anyone taking part in a seance as purely subjective. A good deal of the alleged phenomena may be referred to the third explanation, telepathy, in which case we have to do with a working hypothesis, rather than with something of which we have conclusive knowledge of cause and effect.

Eliminating fraud, conscious or unconscious, making full allowance for the psychological hypotheses—telepathy, subliminal memory, multiple personality,—a residuum still remains. To the present writer it seems far from clear that the remaining explanation, that of diabolic activity, must be wholly discarded—we may say that the production of the phenomena is the price we pay for our practical disregard of diabolology. In facts, in the works we are studying we find certain indications of it. We have noted the vagueness of the communications as to the conditions of the life which lies beyond—very many of the alleged communications are paltry, trivial in matter,—if it be of diabolic agency it is natural to suppose that God would not permit that to be revealed which He did not will, and the general content of Divine Revelation shows that it is not God's purpose that we should have detailed information regarding the conditions of life in the other world; what is given is sufficient for moral purposes but does not min-

ister to a curiosity that we must regard as idle. As to the character of the spirits there is "a consensus of testimony to the effect that communicating spirits have habitually a less regard for truth than is the case with highly-educated human beings" (Sciens, p. 71). "That some of the spirits in circumterrestrial space are, in a sense, vagabonds, without kith, kin or any specific identity connected with humanity, may well be the case, and it is now and then a matter of observation; but this is not any reason why they should find any satisfaction in masquerading as Tom, Dick and Harry" (except when the assumption of the personality of Tom, Dick or Harry serves to convey evidence of the reality and presence of the spirit impersonated, then there is reason of the utmost importance for the assumption of the character). "There is probably some amusement to be extracted from personating a great figure of history, such as Julius Caesar, Luther, Napoleon, Disraeli, or Gladstone" (which would explain the communications of Dr. Watson's book) "and inducing both mediums and sitters to accept with reverence the pompous utterances of ridiculous banalities" (a good description of the communications set down by Dr. Watson) "and the history of Spiritualism shows that something of the kind does really happen now and then" (Sciens, p. 116). We may enquire if this is not exactly what we should expect of evil spirits, who are of him who was "a liar from the beginning"? Sciens' conclusion (p. 117), "Any person of ordinary good sense is quite capable of distinguishing between sham and reality even when speaking with the dead is in question," is very far from convincing. We may note also how in the communications which Mrs. Crawford receives, "disintegrating forces," "malign powers" try to introduce error (e. g., p. 199).

Let us emphasize the fact that Spiritualism is not necessarily a religious phenomenon. Dr. Crawford affirms strongly (p. 46) that the investigating of spiritualistic phenomena is not for everybody; but Spiritualism, as a religion, is, as we have seen, based upon this phenomena solely, it is of the very essence of Spiritualism; if some must be warned off it is not a religion for all — according to our Christian canon of judgment at all events. Conceding, as they do, that spiritualistic phenomena form the sum total of its content, its unsuitability as a religion is seen from another angle, for it is without high and true moral and spiritual appeal. Again, it is Montanistic in its passivity, the effort comes from the other side, on this all that is required is receptivity. "All the real work is done on their side of the line and all we do when we sit in the seance room is to supply suitable conditions. That is to say, the sitters are only the instruments through whom the work is done" (Dr. Crawford, p. 98). We have rejected Calvinism, but we are hardly prepared to go to this length in our rejection. Man still has a part in the working out of his own salvation.

Other psychic movements of the time, parading under the name of religion, are emphasizing the effect of the mind upon the body; Dr. Crawford (pp. 47 sqq.) admits, with truth, the possible deleterious effect of the investigation of spiritualistic phenomena upon the health of the investigator. The descriptions of the sittings which Dr. Crawford gives may serve for the rules of a parlor game, or for those of a scientific experiment, but they do not at all describe what we can by the widest extension of the term consider as a religious service. Spiritualism is, in reality, an expansion of naturalistic methods and philosophy, it is the apotheosis of science, the carrying over of scientific meth-

ods into the sphere of the supernatural (*vide* Dr. Crawford's entire book *passim*). "The only truths which it will accept as proven are those revealed by the senses, by physical observations and by actual experience" (Sciens, p. 3). An old and familiar axiom of materialistic naturalism, but surely a new method of seeking religious truth!

The phenomena which, as we have seen, make up the sum total in a spiritualistic religious service, do not at all depend upon religion for their production; "the thoughts need not take any religious turn, and prayer is quite unnecessary" (Sciens, p. 104). "The singing of hymns, praying, and other 'religious' features are to be deprecated" (Sciens, p. 113). Religion is a fundamental instinct of humanity. Being denied, it has taken its revenge upon those so wedded to the scientific spirit that they have become blinded to this fundamental instinct which cannot be permanently suppressed.

Many are greatly influenced by the adherence of well-known scientists to Spiritualism, by the leading part they have in some cases taken in its propagation, but the old proverb has not lost its force, "every man to his trade"; when the scientists try to extend their own methods of investigation so as to bridge the gulf between the physical and the psychical, it is not strange that they should be misled. It is far too late in the day for the Christian thinker to feel any hostility to science as such. He gladly welcomes its help, thankfully acknowledges the testimony it bears to the greatness of God's works; but what every thinker must reject is the attempt to make a philosophy, naturalism, out of the one-sided evidence of science alone; and still more strongly must the Christian thinker reject the making of a religion from it, even when its method is extended to the investigation of psychic phenomena. Science, too, might

have much to say about what it is asked to believe, e. g., Dr. Crawford's theory of the temporary loss of weight, and Sciens' anticipation of advice from the spirits which will make possible the building of a weightless aeroplane, i. e., one exempt from the force of gravitation.

There are, no doubt, many who like Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, "take the gravest possible view of this movement, and regard it as being a fresh departure in religious thought and experience such as we have not had for two thousand years" (Introduction to Mr. Hill's book, p. xxii); but to most of us it will seem simply a revival of the experiences felt in the long distant age of Samuel and Saul, and we shall approve of the words of Kipling:

"Oh the road to En-Dor is the oldest road
And the craziest road of all!
Straight it runs to the Witch's abode,
As it did in the days of Saul,
And nothing has changed of the sorrows in store
For such as go down on the road to En-Dor!"

But it remains one of the most serious obstacles that the Christianity of our time has to meet; the interest in it is shown by the flood of books and magazine articles bearing upon the subject. Mr. Hill says: "there are at least 350 societies holding regular Sunday services in Great Britain" (p. 183). The number of organized societies in America is given in none of the books examined, but the interest is indisputable and it is significant that the New York Public Library reports, in July, 1919, that among the non-fiction books most in demand are those dealing with Spiritualism and with psychic phenomena generally.

The remedy for this attack upon the faith of many of our people must appear to lie in a deeper study of all that concerns the life beyond; a preaching of the comfort that is

contained in what is revealed to us; and, above all, emphasis upon the reality of the Communion of Saints; and the removal of non-Christian ideas of the significance of death. One might accept, with slight amendment, what Dr. Coulter says: "There are no dead. The dead are with you, and you with them" ("Yet all are one in Thee, for all are Thine"). "Harmony between the worlds can be established only when fear of the so-called dead is demolished, and when the friends who succeed in returning to you cease to be regarded as different. They are the same beings as before, their love is the same, only their understanding has grown, while yours has remained atrophied." More generally, Professor Forster's words are suggestive: "Spiritualism, like most other modern religious movements, is due to the Church's timidity, worldliness and want of intelligent teaching and propaganda. Spiritualists are uninstructed people looking for what the Church has left out." The remedy, then, lies in the preaching of the whole Gospel; in a return from the over-emphasis of the present-day upon the conception of religion as a matter chiefly of this world; and, finally, in the conviction that God would leave out of His revelation nothing that it was essential we should know regarding the conditions of life beyond the sphere of this world, and that here "we walk by faith." "The true answer to Spiritualism is to recover within the Church that victorious attitude which marked the early Christians when they faced the fact of death, and to recover too their sense of companionship with their dead which is shown in their prayers. Our mourning and our tombstones do not exhibit this victory over death: they look more like defeat" (Professor Forster, p. 24).

Some Thoughts on "Saint's Progress"

CHRISTINE SMITH.

A REPUTATION is a wonderfully virile thing; once established it dies hard. Mr. Galsworthy has given us in his latest book a piece of work which has attracted, through the *réclame* of his name, attention out of all proportion to its merit. It is a sad fact that Mr. Galsworthy's art has steadily deteriorated. The joy that we had in him when his finest novels "The Man of Property" and "The Country House" appeared in 1906 and 1907 has gradually waned. The high hopes that were excited by his startling dramatic successes, "The Silver Box," "Strife" and "Justice," have been disappointed. There was the promise of real greatness; it has not been fulfilled. "Justice" was a veritable and poignant *cri-de-cœur*, a passionate protest against the inequalities of the law and the senseless severity of our English prison system. No one who was there at the time will ever forget the profound impression made on London by the first production of that play. Everyone flocked to see it. For days London spoke of nothing else. Yet it must be admitted that Mr. Galsworthy owed much to his interpreters, especially to the incomparable artistry of Mr. Dennis Eadie. "The Silver Box," produced some years previously by Miss Horniman's Company of Manchester Players, also gives fine dramatic expression to Mr. Galsworthy's sympathy with the poor and the outcast and illustrates with biting irony the sickening injustice that may be perpetrated in the name of the law. For his sincere hatred of injustice and cruelty, his love of liberty and his deep sympathy with "all who are desolate and oppressed," we pay homage to Mr. Galsworthy.

But the disappointment of his later works is extreme. "How are the mighty fallen!" one feels inclined to exclaim after reading "Saint's Progress," for which the author's most ardent admirers can surely hardly claim even distinction of style. Had the book appeared anonymously one might indeed have credited Dolf Wyllarde, or Elinor Glynn, or some other one of the crowd of the undistinguished with its production. The pity of it is that the lure of Mr. Galsworthy's name gives fictitious importance to a work vague in conception and poor in execution, and thousands of unintelligent persons will quite seriously believe the publisher's assertion that the book "is the fine flowering of genius," and will be enormously impressed by the futility of the Anglican Church, as represented by Edward Pierson, in the face of "the problems of the day"—whatever that may mean—as represented by his daughter, Noel. For the problem is not essentially of today at all; it is the old, old question of whether the flesh or the spirit shall prevail, and, according to Mr. Galsworthy, it had better be the flesh. But can he really mean it? Can he seriously wish to see humanity back at the level of the farmyard? Our quarrel with him is that he does not appear ever to think anything out to its logical conclusion. One might reasonably infer from his writings that to be sensual and to be kind was the whole duty of man, also of woman. His main theme is always sexual emotion, which to be perfect must be unfettered by obedience to any higher law than animal impulse, and, above all, entirely inconsiderate of other people. To subordinate one's private desires to duty to one's neighbor, or to the community, is to be very poor-spirited, to decline "to live," in fact. Pierson's ideal of chastity is absurd, "denying himself everything that was exciting and nice," . . . "venture and wild savour . . . the sharp fruits,

the burning suns, the dark pools, and unearthly moonlight"; all of which, reduced to plain English, means one thing only, and that not nearly so attractive as it can be made to sound by the use of a little rhetoric. There is something very ugly in the scene where Noel and Cyril, inarticulate with passion, mate under the shadow of the ruined Abbey wall—a symbolic touch dear to the heart of the author—and, of course, under the auspices of a bird, or it would not be Mr. Galsworthy writing! Nor can we feel much more sympathy with Noel when we leave her—one year later—married (legally, this time, we suppose?) to the just discarded lover of her middle-aged cousin, of whose entirely sensual *liaison* she had been perfectly aware throughout. No, we cannot like Noel; indeed, the only soul in the book for whom it is possible to feel unmitigated sympathy, is Noel's unfortunate child. However, we are told by Gratian, Noel's elder sister, who, like so many of Mr. Galsworthy's women is too indistinctly realized to be convincing, that Noel's marriage to Fort "will be so good for the baby," and we must hope it was.

Mr. Galsworthy's priest is a very pathetic figure. It is difficult to conceive of anyone quite so inept as the vicar of an important London parish. One wonders how on earth he ran it, with his lack of perception, of forcefulness, of insight into character, of humor, of skill in argument, of sound common sense, indeed, of almost any positive quality. A vague amiability seems to have been his only asset. We leave him, at last, in Egypt, whither he has gone as a military chaplain, trying—ineffectually, of course—to comfort a dying soldier. Our final glimpse of Pierson is standing in the desert, "and the breeze ruffling the desert sand, blew the grains against the palms of his hands, outstretched above the warm earth," which, as the publisher is obliging

enough to inform us, "is a most significant culmination."

But significant of what? Surely only of the failure of Edward Pierson's own life; of his utter inability to translate into a vital force the creed which he professed. His faith appears to have been of that indefinite and indeterminate quality which is not usually productive of power. So we agree with the author that his hero is a pitiful figure, though not for the same reasons. We cannot admit that it was his chastity, his self-denial, his acceptance of authority, that were the undoing of Pierson, as Mr. Galsworthy so curiously seems to wish us to believe.

And in this attitude towards life, Mr. Galsworthy certainly does not stand alone. He is supported by a notable company of fellow writers. It is the cult of the moment. To discredit and throw aside the experience of the past, to fling authority—especially the authority of the Church—to the winds, to indulge in and to glorify what one likes simply because one likes it, and to adopt a "go-exactly-as-you-please" attitude towards all moral questions, is, both in theory and practice, the literary creed of the hour. A vague, sentimental humanitarianism would appear to be regarded as the cardinal virtue. Orthodox Christianity is extremely unfashionable, and if anyone had the temerity to write a novel dragging it in otherwise than in derision, it would certainly not be a "best seller."

And as to the title: one may, perhaps, legitimately ask, what does Galsworthy know of saints? Has he any real conception of their being? Has he ever caught a glimpse of that vision under the compelling power of which saints are fashioned? One rather judges that he writes as a blind man decrying the gift of sight. At all events, we entirely fail to recognize in the portrait of poor, futile Edward Pierson, the portrait of a saint. The saints of God, "those spir-

itual phenomena with which all history is as closely spotted and spangled as the sky is with stars," were made of sterner stuff. Yet, we suppose, each in his day and hour must have been an object of hatred, of scorn and of pity to those who watched without understanding, to those among their fellows who had never had any perception of the supreme Beauty, nor adventured themselves upon the supreme Quest.

Episcopalians or Churchmen

REV. CHARLES CARROLL EDMUNDS, D.D.

IN all the discussion which goes on, here and in England, regarding reunion with our Protestant brethren, far too much emphasis, we believe, is laid on episcopacy and far too little on the Church. Our High Churchmen are exceedingly anxious that the ministers of the religious bodies about us should receive ordination from a bishop, but they would seem comparatively careless as to whether they return to the unity of the Church and the fullness of its life. We do not say that they are really so, but too often their words and actions suggest this. They loudly disclaim the desire to impose any doctrine of the grace of Orders, and at the same time they make the laying on of episcopal hands the one vital requirement to which all else should be subordinated. They declare that we have no desire to make Episcopalians of our friends of other folds, and yet the plans proposed would make Episcopalians and nothing more! It is small wonder that they whom we seek to win are puzzled and a trifle suspicious, or attribute to us a magical and mechanical view of ordination, or perhaps indignantly reject the little we offer. Whatever our opinion

may be regarding the wisdom of the proposed legislation permitting a Concordat with certain Congregationalists, no one is so sanguine or so fearful as to expect any large number to avail themselves of its provisions. It is what the French would term a "gesture." Its chief merits in the thought of its supporters and its chief dangers in the mind of its opponents, lie in its implications. And a main, if not the supreme implication would seem to be that "the tactual succession," in the barest sense, is all-important — one might almost say — all-sufficient.

The present writer is not likely to be suspected of doubting the necessity of episcopacy, but he does feel strongly that an unfortunate emphasis is laid upon it, both in the name by which we are popularly known and in much of the current discussion. Historically, almost every heresy has arisen from the exaggeration of some single truth and the ignoring of a counter-truth. Experience has shown that it has been possible to fall into serious error by dwelling too exclusively on the Godhead or on the Manhood of our Lord, on the omnipotence of God or on the free-will of man. It would appear probable that an undue stress on episcopacy might be followed by similar results. In the sense that we believe in one God we might perhaps be termed Unitarians, but to be a Unitarian and nothing more is to reject the deity of our Lord, an essential part of the Faith. An Episcopalian who is an Episcopalian and nothing more may be far from Catholic Christianity. Illustrations abound.

No modern student of the New Testament will doubt that from the beginning Christianity was a social institution. The supposition that it was a mere aggregation of individuals happening to hold similar opinions, who chose to come together for purposes of convenience, has passed into the limbo of exploded theories. The phrase in Acts,

"The Lord was adding together daily those who were being saved," exactly expresses the fact. The Church then is the Body of Christ. It is to the Church that the promises of Christ have been given, and it is through it that His grace is bestowed. It is to the voice of the Church that we are to listen, it is in its worship that we are to share, and it is in its unity that we are to abide. The Church has ministers because it is an organism of a higher grade than a jellyfish and must have differentiated organs to perform the functions of the Body. They are its members—the hands by which it works, the feet on which it is carried, the mouth by which it speaks. They are as needful to the Church as the literal organs are to our human bodies. Without them it cannot act or live. It is idle to dispute whether they are of its *esse* or its *bene esse*; it is enough that they belong to it and that through them it functions.

But the ministry is made for the Church, and not the Church for the ministry. It is the Church which acts in and through them. Apart from it they are unmeaning and dead. That certainly was the view taken by the Fathers of the earliest Christian centuries with regard to the exercise of orders outside the communion of the Church. Even in those days Christians were divided, by reason of our unhappy human frailty, into contending sects; and rival bishops laid claim to sees and to the allegiance of the faithful. There was no question as to the proper minister of ordination; no one seems to have thought any other than by a bishop possible, and Arians and semi-Arians, Donatists and Novatianists, Nestorians and Eutychians, had bishops, priests and deacons, constituted in due form. But the Church steadily refused to acknowledge the validity of acts performed by those outside her communion, although episcopally ordained. In the view of that age it was the au-

thority of the Church, rather than the orders of the minister which gave efficacy to his acts. What the Church recognized was valid, what the Church disallowed was invalid—even if performed by a bishop.

In popular language we are sometimes said to “believe in bishops.” But the Creed asserts belief, not in bishops, but “in the One Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church.” True, the Church is Apostolic, and the term implies among other things the possession of a ministry in due succession from the Apostles, but after all the noun in the sentence is the *Church*, and Apostolic is an adjective expressing a quality belonging to the Church. The Church is further defined as “One, Holy, and Catholic,” but no one of these descriptive terms is to be isolated or exaggerated out of proportion. Our Roman brethren have laid too exclusive an emphasis on Unity, and in their efforts to secure it by the means of uniformity have defeated the very purpose they had at heart. Many Protestant bodies have imitated the ancient Donatists by regarding Holiness as the one essential, and by fixing on certain external tests have tended to reduce the Church to a small and narrow sect. Others are so “Catholic,” and so impatient of all restriction on freedom of thought, that they appear to extend an equally generous welcome to all varieties of belief and unbelief. We fear that there are some who in their zeal for Apostolicity are tempted to make too little of other notes of the Church, and even forget that it is to the Church that these belong.

It is this overvaluation of episcopacy, in the seeming belief that in it is to be found the panacea for the healing of our divisions, and the consequent undervaluation of the Church, that form a fatal weakness in the plan lately offered in General Convention by some of the most distin-

guished members of that body. One can appreciate and admire their purpose, their courage, and their genuine zeal for unity. One must respect the sincere religion and remarkable generosity of those Congregationalist ministers who have united in the proposal of this Concordat. But it is all very extraordinary—so extraordinary that we are tempted to think that neither party really understands the other. For, not only is a share in the Catholic priesthood to be given to men whose whole present position proclaims that they do not believe in it, and this in order to enable and authorize them to offer a Sacrifice they deny, and to administer the Body and Blood of Christ to a congregation which confessedly does not accept its reality, but, moreover, all this is to be done in order that these godly and earnest men may remain Congregationalists! And a Congregationalist is by definition one who regards each individual congregation to be a Church! Truly, a situation worthy of the ingenious foolery of Alice in Wonderland.

Objections to the Proposed Concordat

REV. HARRY HOWE BOGERT.

MANY of us view with the gravest apprehension the step proposed by this Church in ordaining Protestant preachers to the Priesthood, and our reasons therefore are grounded on the threefold principle of safeguarding the Doctrine, Discipline and Worship of the Church.

1. *Doctrine.* St. Paul's injunction to the Corinthians was, "Examine yourselves, whether ye be in the faith" (II Cor. xiii, 5).

I find in this proposed Concordat no such demand for those Protestant preachers who may seek Catholic Orders.

There is a sentence used very frequently in our formularies, viz., "as this Church hath received the same, which means, most evidently, that "this Church" holds the doctrine of the Creed as it was ever held and handed down by the ancient Fathers, and expounded by the Seven General Councils.

Heretofore, when a Protestant preacher applied for Holy Orders, he was put under certain training as to his faith, and made to pass the canonical examinations provided for all candidates for the Sacred Ministry.

But here we have a new thing proposed: no matter what the man knows, holds, or believes, he can be admitted to the majestic office of the Priesthood at the option of a bishop without a stated examination, and if the bishop is easy-going, with practically little or no knowledge of the Catholic Religion "as this Church hath received the same," but filled full of "erroneous and strange doctrine contrary to God's Word," which I had to solemnly vow I would banish and drive away from the Church before I could be ordained.

Can this result in anything but confusion? Imagine the situation in a city where a dozen or more sects are flourishing, presided over by preachers conscientiously holding the peculiar tenets of their respective bodies, but all of them desirous of obtaining the Priesthood, and upon application being ordained by the bishop and going back to their congregations to teach exactly the same heresies they taught before. Here is one priest refusing Holy Baptism to the children; another priest teaching the possibility of living a sinless life; another priest declaiming on the election to salvation or damnation of individuals by a fiat of Almighty

God; another priest holding to sudden conversion for all, and so on through the list, while all unite in disbelief in Baptismal Regeneration, the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist, Priestly Absolution, Consecration, or Blessing, and, in fact, practically all that is distinctively Catholic in theology.

Such a condition of chaos in the name of Christian Unity would appear to be the sublime attainment of satanic endeavor.

2. *Discipline.* As things are in the Church today, we have plenty of discipline for the clergy, but precious little for the laity. The poorly instructed layman, for instance, does not hesitate to leave the Church for any real or imaginary grievance he may have, and take refuge with the most popular preacher of the town who receives him with open arms. But if these popular preachers are made priests, what becomes of the little discipline we have? Being themselves free from the discipline which guides the clergy of the Church, they are free-lance priests, but priests nevertheless, and therefore they administer valid Sacraments. Consequently, if things don't happen to suit the disgruntled parishioner, though he be well instructed, he will hie himself off to one of these eclectic priests for his Communion and other ministrations, and what can the rector do about it?

I predict that this will be a greater source of disorder in our parishes than anything we have yet had to meet.

And as for the preacher-priest himself, what is to hinder him from teaching all kinds of heresy? To whom is he amenable for what he preaches. Certainly not in any adequate sense to the bishop. He cannot be regularly tried, as he does not come within the canons of the Church for this. If he is *very popular*, particularly by being active in civic

affairs, woe betide the plodding, faithful parish priest. Assuredly the result in many cases will be, for the Church priest, failure, dismal failure, followed by his resignation.

Again, what is to prevent an unscrupulous Congregational priest, or Methodist priest, or Presbyterian priest (euphonious titles these!) from enticing parishioners away from the parish church to unite with his congregation? Can the rector appeal to the bishop? Possibly, but to what avail? I wonder if the advocates of this proposal ever gave these questions a thought.

3. *Worship.* It is unquestionably true that the art of Christian worship has become almost a lost art among the Protestant bodies. In truth, in those parishes of our own Church where glorified Morning Prayer is the chief service of the Lord's Day (except on holy First Sunday), religious worship is at a very low ebb.

But if Christian Unity means anything, it certainly must carry with it some degree of unity in worship, as well as in doctrine and discipline. The great thing among Protestants is the sermon. They go to the meeting (styled "Preaching Service") to be entertained, and are thus spoken of as "audiences," not congregations. Imagine any kind of true religious worship in a building where the place in which the people gather is called an "auditorium," and is built like one, that is, like a theatre with sloping floor so people cannot kneel. There will be the priest but no altar, except the platform which Protestants designate now as the "altar"! Imagine a Solemn High Mass in such a place!

Then there are those gatherings of people who interpose (I was going to say interrupt) with loud "Amens," whenever the one who is praying takes a breath. I say, the one who is praying, for often the preacher calls on some "brother" or "sister" to "lead in prayer."

No, worship is dead, utterly and unmistakably dead among Protestants. Will making the preacher a priest change all this? One must be a confirmed optimist to hope that it will.

If Doctrine, Discipline, and Worship are not involved in Christian Unity, I fail to see any need at all for attempting to attain it. So far as I can discover, there is not a thought of these things in the proposed Concordat, much less any definite statement to that effect; and without this, there can result nothing but untold disaster if the proposed innovation, as it now stands, becomes a law of the Church.

Eyes That See

REV. STANLEY M. CLEVELAND.

CHRISTIANITY has always been a forward-looking religion. It is mad about the future. Bergson says that the trouble with the life force, the *élan vital*, in biology, in nations, and in men is its tendency to turn in on itself, to become lost in the contemplation of its own accomplishment, to stagnate, to crystallize, and all insensibly to go backwards, to die. We see that tendency at work always in men and in events, in ourselves. The artist lost in admiration of his finished picture, instead of spurning it in the drive of creative desire to paint a new one; the disciple of "What always has been must be"; the stock phrase of Ruggles of Red Gap, "It isn't done with us"; classicism in literature, ultra-conservatism in politics—all are examples of this tendency to stagnation, to crystallization, to death. Let us however hasten to add that there is a conservatism which is not retrogression, which is merely

cautious advance, instead of fanatical and thoughtless leaping forward. In other words, there is a distinction between blind radicalism based on the desire of the moment — like modern Bolshevism, which, in trying to produce real democracy, has produced the vilest of tyrannies; and conservative radicalism which moves forward along the continuing contours of our human past experience. There is great need for the realization of this distinction just at the present time.

Christ was radical. His Church must needs be radical. But it has been radical in the latter sense, conservatively radical, not forgetting yesterday in the dawn of tomorrow. The historian Lecky, like many great men extraordinarily diffident in society, found himself with a young and effusive dinner companion, absolutely speechless. They had nothing in common. There was nothing to say. Finally he ventured "How do you like history?". "Oh," she gurgled, "I always let bygones be bygones."

The Church never lets bygones be bygones. No more does it let them be fetters, chains binding it into immobility, stagnation, crystallization and death. It is deeply rooted in the past of God's purpose, Christ's revelation and the steady, if often cataclysmic advance of God's purpose working itself out in human history. There have been a few times when it seemed to turn backward, — chiefly in the early middle ages, not today, thank God, — but it never turned completely. Even in the Dark Ages the burning hope of Heaven kept men and the Church who made them, looking forward. It is planted on the rock of the past, on Jesus of Nazareth, on the creeds, the ministry, the sacraments, and just because it is planted on an immovable rock, — "other foundation can no man lay than is laid, even Jesus Christ," — like a skyscraper, it can go up and up, never very

far ahead of the mass of the people but just far enough ahead to lead them little by little "into all truth"—up and up to the Kingdom of Heaven on earth and the Beatific Vision of the Holiest. Because it is ever looking forward, because it is ever moving forward, its development is sure and steady and "the gates of hell cannot prevail against it."

All the human religions have looked backwards to a golden age in the past, an age which could never be equalled, which could only be imitated. But with Christ it was not so. Because He was always looking forward, forward through the thousands of years which in His sight are but as a watch in the night, He could say that dynamic thing to His disciples: "Blessed are the eyes that see the things which ye see: for I tell you, that many prophets and kings have desired to see those things which ye see and have not seen them: and to hear those things which ye hear and have not heard them!"

"Blessed are the eyes that see the things that ye see," said our Lord, and yet what a world of chaos and corruption they looked out upon! Their ancient religion, crystallized into formalism and spiritual powerlessness, had become just one huge political intrigue. "Woe unto you Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites, for ye are like unto whited sepulchres, which outwardly appear beautiful, but inwardly are full of dead men's bones and all uncleanness."

The Roman conquest had given a semblance of unity to the Empire but under the surface there were tremendous stirrings of social and national passions, soon to break out into bitter revolution. They saw with the eyes of our Lord the coming doom of Jerusalem, "and ye shall hear of wars and rumors of wars . . .," "nation shall rise against nation and kingdom against kingdom, and there shall be earthquakes in divers places; when, therefore, ye shall

see the abomination of desolation . . . standing in the holy place . . . then shall be a great tribulation such as has not been since the beginning of the world, until now." The future was indeed dark! Through their eyes, opened to the realities of things by their companionship with Christ, they saw national, social, and racial crisis. They looked ahead, and, humanly speaking, they could see nothing better. "The sea and the waves roaring and men's hearts failing them for fear."

Then, on the other hand, they saw Jesus, their companion, their leader, their guide. They felt the dynamic of Him, the power of Him, the love of Him, and, looking through His eyes at the sordid mess the world had made of itself, they saw hope, the hope of the Kingdom of God on earth; the hope of the coming of the Son of Man in power and in glory; the hope of the coming of a new world, a new civilization, where Christ would be Lord, having put all things under His feet, and God would be all in all. They saw that present chaos was God's opportunity; that catastrophe was God's method of education. They realized that since Christ had come, truly blessed were the eyes that saw the things that they saw, because the future was in God's hands. Consequently when He burst out upon them, "Blessed are the eyes that see the things that you see," "All power is given unto me in heaven and earth, go ye therefore into all the world and teach all nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost,"—they went forth in that power and accomplished the impossible.

Let us make no mistake,—they did accomplish. St. James, St. John, St. Peter, above all St. Paul, spread the seed of Christianity, Christian civilization through the length and breadth of the Roman Empire, till centuries

later Latin Christianity is set forth as the greatest determining factor in the life and politics of the Middle Ages, and later laid the foundations of modern democracy. Their job, up to the present, was to Christianize on the surface the nations of the world, to bring about what we call today, perhaps, a superficial Christianity; a Christianity which was so only in name; but which, nevertheless, ploughed and harrowed and made fallow the field for that new, more fully developed Christianity and Christian civilization which is upon us, and of which we are a part. Their job was to Christianize the body. Ours is to Christianize the heart and soul of nations, of industries, and of men.

Today, we too, look out on chaos; wars still rage as the aftermath of the great conflict with Germany. The high cost of living is making living impossible for the many, extravagant for the few; Bolshevism in Russia, class-conscious, hostile, tyrannical; the dictatorship of the proletariat gone mad and become the dictatorship of Lenine; the threatened railway strike, the steel strike, the longshoremen's strike, the coal strike and a hundred others, challenge not our nation only, but our Christianity.

We have come to the end of our era! Another of the 500-year focal points of history is upon us! Again we see the abomination of desolation standing where it ought not; again we hear the sea and the waves roaring, the tides of revolution rising and breaking, men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking upon those things which are coming upon the earth. Again we hear the footsteps of the coming of the Son of Man, coming in catastrophe and cataclysm as He always comes, in power and great glory to drive the world and human civilization one step forward in the accomplishment of His work. And we, we are the instruments of His purpose. Today we look out on chaos.

The future is dim to the eyes that will not see, or indifferent to those who, satisfied with the comfort of the moment, like the ostrich, bury their heads in the sand. But, "Blessed are the eyes that see the things which ye see," "for the end of all things is at hand." "Repent ye! for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand," and we, under God, are the builders of His Kingdom.

It is a thrilling opportunity; it is a terrible responsibility. It means study and hard work for all of us. It means knowing conditions in the world as they are, and facing them as they are. But above all, it means facing Christ. It means seeing Him, hearing Him, feeling the dynamic of Him, the power of Him and His love. "I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto Me!" The world, even if it will, cannot escape the maelstrom of His love. The world is not going to be as it has been; the law of war is not going to be the law of nations. The law of self-interest is not to be the law of politics. The law of class-conscious hatred is not to be the law of industry. God, if it is necessary, if men are blind or refuse to see, will stop short of nothing! It is a small thing for Him to destroy a whole civilization, in order that the Kingdom of Heaven may be advanced. He cares for us personally and individually, but He does not care for our petty schemes, our man-made panaceas, if they run counter to His great, social purpose of the saving of the race. He has destroyed civilizations before, Egypt, Babylon, Greece, Rome, which He weighed in the balance and found wanting. He is weighing us in the balance, now!

We all have schemes for the social and political regeneration of the world. They do not matter save as they are one with Christ's scheme; and we are not the judges as to whether our schemes are His will; He alone is judge. There are very few of us who do not want to play some part

in the rebuilding of the world. Most of us would like to build solidly. There is only one solid foundation for our building; that is Jesus Christ. We must first know His will if we are to build according to His will. Each of us He wants to use, in the field of activity which He has chosen and laid out before us, to which He has called us, as politicians, economists, diplomats, historians, business men, financiers, skilled artisans, mechanics, salesmen, laborers. For each one of us He has something to do. To Him each one of us must come for orders; then, doing His work in His way, rebuilding His world according to His plan, fulfilling His promise with His tools, we shall see the future with a new hope, nay a new certainty, that blessed are the eyes that see the things which we see, because we see them through His eyes. So the appeal is to us individually, to know Christ, to be His men, to seek through prayer and study and sacrifice, unity with His life; that when His orders come to us, we may hear and respond with Isaiah, "Lord, here am I, send me!" If our interest is in building a new world, or purifying and making strong the old one, in carrying forward the development, under God, of His Kingdom on earth, then first, first, first, we must get into contact with Christ. He is alive; He is the power behind all this massive development. We are either with or against Him. We must be with Him.

Is it that you realize this necessity, the necessity of getting into contact with Christ, if ever you are to be effective in saving the world; and yet, do not know how to get into contact with Christ? Have you never realized that just that is what priests are for? We are not politicians, nor economists, nor financiers, nor labor leaders. We are not of those into whose hands the actual work in the regeneration of the world is placed. But we are, or ought to be, by

our calling and our training, trained in the science of the approach to Christ. Some of us have not gone very far with Him. All of us are acutely conscious of our own sins, our own unworthiness for the positions we hold, but all of us know the way, the way that better men than we can follow to successful remaking of the world, the way into the heart of Christ. And, if you do not know the way to come into contact with Christ, we are here as trained officers of His Church to tell you. The Church wants to show you the way, for upon your knowing the way depends the salvation of the world. "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free," and not you only, but the whole world,— "free with that liberty wherewith Christ has made us free." The Church wants you to know the way, lest turning in on yourself you stagnate and crystallize and die; or go off on fruitless tangents of a man-made radicalism, instead of God-made advance; lest, in the face of the greatest opportunity ever offered to a generation, we be like those Jews of Jesus' own generation, to whom, walking blindly, oblivious to Him, He cried: "Whereunto shall I liken this generation; it is like unto children sitting in the market place who call upon their fellows and say, we piped to you and you did not dance; we wailed and ye did not mourn." No, we shall not be like those of whom St. John wrote: "He came unto His own and His own received Him not." "The light shone in the darkness, and the darkness comprehended it not." Rather our spirit shall be, as we seek Him, and see through His eyes the tremendous opportunities for service, the spirit of Rupert Brooke:

"Now God be thanked who has matched us with His hour,
And caught our youth, and wakened us from sleeping,
With hand made sure, clear eye, and sharpened power;
To turn, as swimmers into cleanness leaping . . ."

John the Baptist

A Study in Modernity.

H. ADYE PRICHARD, M.A.

A PROPHEET? Yea, and more than a prophet! John the Baptist was a climax—unenduring perhaps, but terrifyingly exalted, like the great storm waves that lift themselves at awful periods in a tempest, and make the voyager feel that each one must be the last. He looked forward less than he looked back, because in his own person the grief and horror of the past found agonized epitome.

Across the gulf of nineteen hundred years the phantoms of his mind have become once more the sentinels of our civilization. Repent! We are bidden to repent with clamorous insistence—not so much in the spiritual depths of heart or soul, but in the more visible realms of body and mind. Repentance is, first of all, a breaking with the past because the past was bad. But just as a hurried gardener in the early springtime, clawing eagerly at the weeds that he may root them out, drags up with them so much that would be profitable and beautiful, so the anxious amateur in the science of repentance cuts deeper than the evil growth would warrant. We have sinned—and the war was the great purifier of the evils that gave it birth. But we have not sinned exclusively. There were good things in industry and society before the war; political machinery was not wholly corrupt; and man was not merely the besotted brute that some would have us believe. There must have been fair soil in which the flowers of the war's idealism found their roots.

But, in our new-found agony of repentance, we spare

nothing that the old-time harvest has left behind. We make all things new, irrespective of whether the things before had in them the elements of goodness or not. The reaction against militarism and the machinery of the mass brought individualism, and now each mediocre man demands the same recognition that is rightly accorded to the best of his class. What can one do to readjust the scale of wages when a poor workman feels that he is entitled to the same return as a good workman? And conversely, the exploitation of absolutism and despotism produced, in the tide of affairs, the great emphasis of unionism. The salvation of the world may lie in the union of the best individuals; it certainly cannot lie in the union of the worst; and it is doubtful if the union of the best and worst will produce a satisfying equilibrium. But the union of the best individuals is an aristocracy. And aristocracy is anathema. So reads the logic of democracy.

Surely a more far-sighted man than John the Baptist, speaking through the aftermath of war, would have told us that repenting is not re-creation. There were evils enough that might have been exorcised — sweat shops, and child labor, and the menace of the doctrine that might is right, and the things that stink in the nostrils of the man and woman who live together in happy marriage, and bring up their boys and girls. Those things have not gone. In fact the doctrine that might is right is receiving almost a clearer recognition among the trades unions of this and other countries than it did in the ruling class of Germany. But there were goods that had done no harm—a contentment, a policy of living and letting live, a firm foundation of law and order—those things have gone. Our repentant sinner has pruned away the flowers while he overlooked many of the weeds.

John the Baptist, with his harsh diet and his crude dress, meant to preach a doctrine of personal perfection. What he probably did, although the story is mercifully hidden, was so to re-mould his converts that they were totally unfit to carry on the inspired traditions of their race, and found it easier to crucify the Lord of Glory than to believe in the Man of Sorrows. They were entirely new-born—body and soul new-born; and all the good that the red blood of Abraham sent coursing through them was wasted to make room for the milk and water of piety. John Kelman has a sentence that is descriptive of a very little recognized truth. He is speaking of the war. "Never since Aristotle has the world had so sharp a lesson in the doctrine of the golden mean. It has discovered that all the vices put together are not so dangerous a menace to society as a few excellent virtues run wild." One such virtue is the virtue of repentance.

And, in the final analysis, the parable of the Seven Devils can still hold its own against the wisdom of the world. It is dangerous to probe to the bottom; it is bad to render empty and void. No man, in the stormy voyage of life, should dare to cast overboard the least jot or tittle of his spiritual cargo unless he has something better at hand with which to restore the balance. This is no argument against the power and the beauty of repentance. Far from it! But it is an argument against the folly of sending the soul, naked and ashamed, among the wild beasts without a protector by its side. Repentance, in its true and sacred meaning, is the replacement of the evil by the good—the shuddering at the horror of the past in the light of the glory of the future.

It may, perhaps, be said that John was aware of the danger of a spiritual vacuum, and took steps to supply the need. "Repent, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand." Cast out

the old, and place the new within you! This was good advice; but poor pedagogy. For John never said what the Kingdom of Heaven was. It sounded the promissory note of all those benefactors who supply a vacuum with the words, "Come in again in a month's time and I'll see what I can do." It helped no one; it cheered no one; it filled no one's heart with a new enthusiasm or a more sanguine hope. It showed, perhaps, John's trust in Jesus as being able to supply what he could not even describe. But it leaves one wondering anxiously what would have happened to the converts if the Advent had been delayed.

John the Baptist could not measure or describe the Kingdom of Heaven because he could not picture a Social Gospel. The condition of personal piety was the horizon of his vision. A condition of personal piety is still the horizon of the vision of many of those who "call themselves Christians." But Jesus took personal piety for granted—it was a very small and unimportant thing—and, when He wanted to prove to John himself that the Kingdom of Heaven was having its charter written in the hearts of men, He sent him no record of His own devotions and flagellations. He rendered His report as the first missionary of Christian Service. "Go and shew John again those things which ye do hear and see: the blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, and the poor have the Gospel preached to them." John may, after that, have peopled his cell with the visions of men and women helping each other in a fairer and happier world than any he had ever known—but the message came too late.

So, with no Jesus to strike the fire of meaning into a word, we mutter "Reconstruction," and know not what we say. The idea it stands for is no more clear to us than the

idea of the Kingdom of Heaven to the disciples of the Jordan. What is Reconstruction? It is at hand—and we have repented as far as we were able, and wait in trembling anxiety to unlock the doors of our hearts for the new and gracious truant. Sometimes they construe it for us as a feverish effort to make everybody's business our own, and sometimes they speak weightily of the glory and dominion of isolation. On the one hand we are perilously near chaos, on the other equally threatened with atrophy. Is Reconstruction a world ideal or the prerogative of a personal ambition? We ought to know soon, for there are mighty Devils hammering at the doors.

Jesus reconstructed the world because He forced the world to be concentric; that is, to spread out from Him like the ripples from a sinking stone. His immediate power was felt by those nearest to Him—the lame and the lepers and the blind of Judaea and Galilee. There was no world movement beyond the restless striving of countless individuals rubbing against their companions from the center to the circumference. Will modern Reconstruction adopt the same method? Or shall the boundaries and finances of independent countries feel the adjusting finger while lynchers murder and Sinn Feiners terrorize and strikers smile at anarchy? When John had finished with the individual soul, all he had to do, in order to be the greatest man of all time, was to point his convert to the soul next door. And that is exactly what he failed to do. Let us be fair to him. He is recorded as advising the people to give one of their two coats or loaves of bread to him that had none; but the emphasis seems to fall on the good that this act would do the giver. It is an exercise in asceticism, not an experiment in altruism. The figure of John the Baptist is not that of a philanthropist, but a disciplinarian. He has

received his mead of praise in words such as these: "To this day the careers of men like General Gordon and Lord Kitchener illustrate what may be achieved in Asiatic lands by John's code of financial correctitude, backed by strict military discipline. All that is great in British control of India and Egypt and Uganda resolves itself, politically, to the wisdom of John the Baptist. In every land, he who was the forerunner of our Lord stands forth as a champion of public right against all such hideous allurements as those of Tammany Hall. For states and municipalities, for democracies and despotisms, this last appeal of Moses and the Prophets is a true word of exhortation. Yet, in the deeper sense, it failed. Those publicans alone entered the Kingdom who, like Matthew and Zaccheus and the crowds that heard the parables, came from John to Jesus."

The curse of Reconstruction is generalization—to talk of the Kingdom of Heaven instead of Sacrifice and Service and Love. As God was omitted in all the official proclamations of war's cessation, so God will probably be omitted from all official plans of future betterment. Which puts the responsibility for honoring God upon the individual who feels that there is still the shadow of a great rock in a panting and broken land.

And, when the individual really feels that, he knows a sensation of great joy. It is something beyond price to have the peace that passes all understanding, to say with the conviction of sincerity, "Not my will, O Lord, but Thine be done." But joy was foreign to the nature of John the Baptist. We cannot conceive that he ever felt the thrill of the truest imaginable happiness which comes from the consciousness of service rendered to the approval of God. As one writer puts it, "John was humble, courageous, honest, self-less, but the pathos of his career lies in this—that he

was eager, not happy, in his mission." We think of him peering out of the narrow window of his dungeon with almost a scowl upon his features, looking aggressively alike at the joys and the follies of the world. He tasted the bitterness which comes to all reformers when, out of the ruin of what they have pulled down, they see no new shrine rising. There never was a more poignant *De Profundis* than his desolate cry, "Art Thou He that should come, or do we look for another?"

Look around upon the faces of our leaders today and mark the wrinkled brow, the haggard eyes, the drawn mouth. No, there is no contentment among the nations. There is nothing of the joy that comes when the work of God is done, and the book of God is closed. We are not happy in this new life that has come to us. It is fraught with too much uncertainty, and we do not see clearly enough whither it is leading. The glory of the Kingdom of Heaven must be consciously recognized before it can be reflected in our faces, and the chaos of Reconstruction brings as yet no traces of glory. Perhaps it is too soon. Rome was not built in a day; and a world which has been through the pangs of childbirth cannot be normal in a moment. If we can only train ourselves and persuade our leaders to use simplicity instead of complexity, to see God in daily life and continual relationships, to work from inside instead of outside, it may be that a prophet of the Kingdom will be vouchsafed us to bring once more the smile of gladness to our lips. Christ has caused more tears to human kind than any other teacher of the race — but most of them are felt and treasured as tears of joy.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Art of Public Worship. By the Rev. Percy Dearmer, D.D. Milwaukee: The Morehouse Publishing Co., 1919.

The book which bears this title contains the Bohlen Lectures delivered in Philadelphia in January last and also four additional chapters on related subjects. The essays are more technical than the lectures and should provoke very careful thought. They are suggestive even when they are not challenging. The discussion of Popular Services, together with examples of such services, may well cause some to shudder and others to hope. When these others become sufficiently numerous or influential, we shall discriminate, justly and religiously, between different provisions for public services of differing degrees of elasticity, and shall minister to many, instead of only to what we carelessly call "the normal," needs of many sorts of people. That Dr. Dearmer's adjective "popular" for such services is not meant to imply any degradation, of art or of religion, is made clear by his own concluding sentence: "And the most popular service of all is that which was invented by One whom the people followed gladly—the Lord's Supper—if only the Church will offer it disentangled from Matins and Litany and Sermon, and with a hand as generous, as humane and as unfettered as that of her Master Himself."

The lectures are a brilliant plea for beauty and reality in worship. They assume indeed that beauty and truth, if not synonyms, are of the closest kinship and, with goodness, make the content of religion. The lectures are, of course, original and versatile; they are often dogmatic in tone, for "art and morals are ultimate realities, and cannot therefore be explained, but only declared"—a homiletic hint by which many apologetic preachers of the one Gospel might profit. While the fundamental thought of the lecturer is that "art is a necessary part of the worship of God," the exposition of this truth leads him on the one hand to scathing criticism, as of bad hymns, incompetent ministers, criminal lack of thought, inexcusably bad judgment; and, on the other hand, to the luminous discussion of details, as being essentials of true art, and to the attractive setting forth of great ideals. It is impossible to read these pages, sparkling with epigram, glowing with religious fervor, without the growing

convictions that worship demands our best and that the common people will respond to this demand if they are wisely led. For many of our congregations are condemned by bad conditions, bad architecture, bad music, bad preaching, to a listlessness which precludes worship. The lecturer instances one village church which he visited, in which there are sittings for three hundred, but in which, at that service, "scattered in the wilderness of benches, was a congregation, larger than usual, of thirty-nine." Reasonably he adds, "Now it is impossible for a church like that to succeed. The feeling of depression which comes over a little flock in a large pen is a psychological fact that cannot be altered."

These samples of the lecturer's method and point of view indicate his determination to point out the causes of our many failures in trying to teach true religion. Often we do not present it attractively. Often we mar the opportunities for practicing it which we profess and really mean to offer. Sometimes we distort its lineaments by our rigid formalism. The blunders of many sorts, which disfigure the musical rendering of the service are polloried in the lecture on Church Music, in such fashion as this: "Probably the silencing of all organs for a period of ten years would make our churches into nests of singing birds."

The most arousing lecture, in some ways, is that on The Mission Field. Suggested probably and certainly vivified by Dr. Dearmer's experiences in India, it is a noble and an urgent plea for the use of religious common-sense in delivering the message of the Cross to peoples that are not Anglo-Saxon. Too great dependence on preaching, too little use of right ceremonial, very common disregard of radical needs have sorely hindered the inculcation of Christian truth, in many lands. "In the mission-field the Christian Church will do grievous wrong, if she perpetuates the stale results of our West-European follies and sins against the light from sheer want of imagination and lack of devotion." Of course the lecturer insists, with great warrant of Christian history, that the Holy Eucharist must be central, in teaching and in worship; "they really worshipped Christ, the men and women of the constructive centuries." The Church in America can learn much from Dr. Dearmer that will help in her mission in this nation to many people of alien race. They will not become good citizens unless they are good Christians. They will not become Christians of Anglican type. They must have a simpler message than that of the Protestant Episcopal Church; not less fundamental but less complicated; and far more expressive, appealing, compelling. Though

we are not bound to urge them to worship here in their own tongues, we are bound to show them a religion which, in terms and phraseology as in outward token shall be congenial to their racial aptitudes as well as loyal to the primitive Gospel. The beauty of holiness attracts.

"The Art of Public Worship" is a fresh, vigorous contribution to the discussion of present, pressing needs. Any reader who doesn't agree with all of its assertions, is at least challenged to ask himself why he doesn't agree. Every reader should be aroused by it to some bettering of his own thought and habits. If all of its sound criticisms were heeded, if many of its noble ideals were to find truer expression, the public worship of this Church would speedily be transformed.

HERBERT M. DENSLOW.

Thoughts on The Seven Sacraments. By the Rt. Rev. A. C. A. Hall, D.D. Morehouse Publishing Co., Milwaukee, 1919.

Anything coming from the Bishop of Vermont must receive respectful and interested attention. Some of us have for years been strongly influenced by the many little books and pamphlets which we owe to "A. C. A. H." It is rather remarkable that in all their number there is no volume of any considerable size such as one might reasonably expect from such a theologian and scholar. Perhaps it is as well, for great books, or at any rate large books, are not read by many, and these brief and condensed treatises have always possessed an importance and circulation, and so have exercised a power, which might have been lacking to more pretentious publications.

In the pamphlet now before us we have, as the title implies, "thoughts" rather than a systematic treatment. At the start it is pointed out that the description in Article XXV of the "Five commonly called Sacraments" cannot be regarded as happy or correct. Objection is also made to the Roman and Eastern enumeration of "Seven Sacraments" as almost equally unfortunate. We are reminded that for a long time no exact number was fixed, that the reckoning of precisely seven is due to Peter Lombard, that frequently any symbolical action was called a sacrament, that St. Bernard gave this name to feet-washing, and that Peter Damiani counted twelve sacraments. It is urged that the seven, and indeed the five lesser sacraments do not stand together and on the same ground.

To all of this most well-informed Churchmen would assent without

difficulty. But the real question after all is not whether all of these ordinances exactly correspond in "matter" and "form" and "minister" in the scholastic sense of these terms, nor whether all can be brought under the definition of "sacrament" made in our Catechism, but whether there is or not a special grace from God bestowed in and through each. We do not understand Bishop Hall to answer this in the negative, unless possibly in the case of Extreme Unction. It is in his treatment of this subject that we are least able to follow him. He stresses, as many others are now doing, the fact that in the beginning the chief purpose in the anointing was bodily healing, and he calls our attention to the long historical interval between the injunction of St. James and the formal recognition of the sacramental character of Unction. But even the Council of Trent and such a modern work as "The Catechism Explained" of Spirago and Clarke recognize that in unction help is sought for the body as well as for the soul, and the latter authorities reprove the frequent abuse by which the administration of this sacrament is deferred until the sick man is *in extremis*. And surely, whenever prayer is offered for one who is ill, whether this be accompanied by the use of oil or not, spiritual blessing is asked as well as bodily health. It is impossible to think of true prayer as confining itself to the lower object. Moreover, if there is a "constant stream of testimony to the use of oil for healing purposes by Christians in early ages," what does it matter that we possess no evidence "for its application as a religious rite" earlier than the first part of the fifth century? May we not assume that even the medicinal use was not without an appeal to God to bless this outward means? One need not claim for Extreme Unction the same sanction and necessity as Baptism or the Holy Communion, but surely the practice of the Catholic Church, both East and West, for many centuries is not without authority, and all the more that it is supported by Scripture. It is possible that there has too commonly been a practical forgetfulness of the physical benefit to be looked for, but this fault can be corrected. We are persuaded that the present danger is greater concern for the body than for the soul, an eagerness to escape from disease and death rather than for spiritual cleansing and strength. At this time, when so many are looking to various cults for healing, it is of no small practical importance that the Church have something to offer which God has seen fit to bless in past ages to the benefit of both soul and body. And if the rest of the Catholic Church reckons this rite as a "sacrament," why should we refuse it this

title, so long as a clear distinction is drawn between this and the two "generally necessary for salvation"?

We are at a loss to explain how the Bishop can say "it is clear that no individual priest or bishop has authority to revive as a rite of the Church, still less as one of the seven sacraments, what has been deliberately dropped as such." We can understand this position being taken by one who holds "omission is prohibition," or by one who dates the Episcopal Church from Henry VIII or Bishop White, and so regards the canons, rubrics, and usages of the Protestant Episcopal Church since 1534 or 1789 as self-sufficient. But Bishop Hall, both in his previous teaching and practice and even here, would seem to make this impossible by the place he assigns to Penance. True, he asks "Is this, strictly speaking, a separate sacrament? . . . Should we not rather regard the power of the keys . . . as a guarding of the sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist than as a separate sacrament?" But he makes it perfectly clear that he is not objecting to the *thing*, and that he recognizes the right of a priest to give a private and personal absolution to a penitent after a detailed confessions of sins.

But has not this also been "deliberately dropped" from the prayer-book? The *English* book, on which the Bishop's practice was originally formed, does indeed contain in the Visitation of the Sick a provision recognizing it, and in the exhortation to communicants refers to the "benefit of absolution," but both of these have been "deliberately dropped" from the American book, and we are left with the scanty support to be found in the Visitation of Prisoners. Surely some of our Protestant friends might find ground here for a charge of inconsistency! We wonder how much evidence can be adduced for Auricular Confession, save as preparatory for public penance, and as "a rite of the Church," at a date prior to "early in the fifth century." We are quite certain that for the recovery of a large part of our Catholic heritage, once "deliberately dropped," we are indebted to "individual priests and bishops"—and not least to Bishop Hall himself.

C. C. E.

The Story of an English Sister (Ethel Georgina Romanes — Sister Etheldred). By Ethel Romanes. Longmans, Green and Co., London, 1918.

This story of Sister Etheldred, a distinguished and brilliant daughter

of a distinguished and brilliant father and mother, is of unusual interest, and peculiar charm. Much of this is due to the intimate letters which form a good part of the book. Of Ethel Romanes herself, we get a very clear picture of a brilliant, talented and vivacious woman who took not only the Catholic religion, but her own vocation to the Religious Life, simply, whole-heartedly, and enthusiastically. In her life after entering religion, we get the impression of perfect adaptability combined with versatility and a keen sense of humor; and in her last illness, of a dauntless courage. Had she not been taken from earth after six years of community life, she would have left a profound impression far beyond the confines of her order.

P. R. F.

Walled Towns. By Ralph Adams Cram, Litt.D., LL.D. Marshall Jones Co., Boston, 1919.

Dr. Cram tells us that it is not his intention "to write another in the long list of Utopias with which man has amused himself, from Plato to H. G. Wells." Nevertheless, in this fourth volume of the series he has put forth he evidently intends to be "constructive," and he sees clearly a "vision" of the coming "Walled Towns," which represent his solution of the present social and industrial problem. When a man describes a situation wherein "the antithesis between capital and labor would be impossible," where "production would be normally for use, not profit," where "every family would hold land sufficient for its own maintenance," we surely begin to catch the outlines of a Utopian commonwealth. And when, later in the book, "Beaulieu, a Walled Town," is definitely and alluringly described, not only as to its architectural glories, of which one suspects that Dr. Cram must have already made plans and specifications, but also as to its methods of doing business, its religion and government, its control of the franchise and its scheme of taxation, it is difficult to resist the conviction that this vision is denied the name of Utopia for one reason only. For Utopia, in frank English, means "No Place," and Dr. Cram's "Beaulieu" is, to him at least, already visible on the horizon.

Whether others can see his vision as clearly will depend on their willingness to accept his premises. He has declared them with utmost clearness in his earlier books, and they embrace not merely a diagnosis of our present position, but an interpretation of all past history. Central to his view is the conviction that monasticism has been historically the one great

regenerating element in the whole course of Christian civilization. His idea of the Walled Town, that is in the form where monasticism will presently recast its spirit, represents the "way out" of our immediate *impasse*, the third alternative which men may choose instead of Reactionism or Bolshevism.

It appears to us that one step in the argument has been omitted. We jump straight from the crumbling and leaderless present to the perfect synthesis of the Walled Town. St. Benedict did not know that he was to be the founder of western monachism. His motive was the desire to escape from a corrupt world and to find God. He was wholly other-worldly in all his plans. Dr. Cram seems to fall under the condemnation that he gives to the other men of our day, who declare what must be done; in that he gives no chance to God to make known His will. If we go again into the wilderness it must be God Who allures us thither; and we must wait for Him to give us the "door of hope," "the way out" which He may yet reveal.

HARVEY OFFICER, O.H.C.

Bolshevism: Its Cure. By David Goldstein and Martha Moore Avery. Published by Boston School of Political Economy, 1919.

This book is everything that a work on such a serious subject ought not to be. The "cure" suggested by the authors is to make a mistaken diagnosis of the disease, then insist that whatever be the disease it has no real existence save in the crazed imagination of a few idiots, and finally to beat the tom-tom of the obvious and the tom-tom of the inaccurate with hair-raising intensity. The whole ridiculous hodge-podge would be worthy of no serious notice were it not that so respectable an organization as the Knights of Columbus seems to be in some sort its sponsor and that the book itself solemnly states that its statements are the very teaching of the Roman Catholic Church. No imprimaturs of consequence mark its preliminary pages, but this fact may be overlooked by the casual reader, who will think that the Roman Church either has lost its mind or else is seeking to humbug the world. Neither of these conclusions is good for religion.

Chief in its defects is its utter failure to realize the basic cause of the present disturbance of which Bolshevism is only one of the manifestations. It would seem a matter sufficiently notorious, to any thinking stu-

dent of social history, that legal and economic principles and the ethical teachings involved have ever a tendency to lag behind the realities of life. Formulations of law tend, inevitably, to reflect the conditions of the generation before last. This increasing obsolescence it is which endangers in times of crisis and adjustment like our own the preservation of that respect for law and custom some modicum of which is an essential element in the preservation of any social organism. Unless care is taken to change the theory, the disparity between theory and practice reaches a breaking point and there ensues a violent disruption of the existing scheme of things. A new apparatus of ethical principle and legal code is more or less hurriedly gotten together, tested out in the crucible of experience, and society settles down to a new equilibrium.

Our concepts of property ownership and of national patriotism as the end of all allegiance are now fully a century and a half old. Meanwhile the industrial revolution of the last century has transformed property conditions by the entrance of the steam machine, and inventions have so annihilated distance as to make the independent nation as absurd as our fathers saw the independent American state to be a generation ago. The whole social unrest is merely the attempt to adjust obsolescent social and moral theories with new developments of life. In Russia this adjustment was not only more fundamental than elsewhere, because of the conservative law and the conservative Church, but it was rendered more violent because of the stupid mistakes of conservative people there, who, like some Americans, imagine that force can kill ideas. Therefore in Russia it was that the storm broke first and worst. If it is not to break elsewhere it must be prevented by the sane and healthy willingness of all to transform old moral ideas to fit new facts.

All of these obvious facts are well known to the Churches of America and particularly to the Roman Catholic Church, as is witnessed by the program outlined in the Bulletin No. 1 of the Roman Catholic War Council and by many late Roman books, particularly some sponsored by the Jesuits. But this ridiculous volume betrays not an inkling of an idea that such facts exist. For the good of religion some Roman authority should see that Mr. Goldmark and Miss Avery are prevented from writing any more books under Catholic auspices.

BERNARD IDDINGS BELL AND LYFORD PATERSON EDWARDS.

Second Thousand

Just Ready

The Religion of the Prayer Book

BY THE REV. J. G. H. BARRY, D.D.

AND

THE REV. SELDEN P. DELANY, D.D.

12mo. 275 pages. Cloth. Price, \$1.75

(First Edition, March. Second Edition, September, 1919)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. Protestantism.
- II. Papalism
- III. Catholicity.
- IV. The English Reformation.
- V. The Powers of Local Churches.
- VI. Dogmatic Religion.
- VII. Principles of Interpretation.
- VIII. The Incarnation as the Means of Union with God.
- IX. The Sacramental System.
- X. The Nature and Number of the Sacraments.
- XI. Regeneration in Baptism.
- XII. The Difference Between the Baptised and the Unbaptized.
- XIII. Confirmation.
- XIV. The Age for Confirmation.
- XV. The Difference Between Confirmed and Unconfirmed.
- XVI. The Meaning of Sin.
- XVII. The Remission of Sin.
- XVIII. Preparation for the Sacraments.
- XIX. The Real Presence in Holy Communion.
- XX. The Eucharastic Sacrifice.
- XXI. The Chief Act of Worship.
- XXII. The Reservation of the Blessed Sacrament.
- XXIII. The Essentials of Continuity in the Ministry.
- XXIV. The Priesthood.
- XXV. Matrimony.
- XXVI. Ceremonial.
- XXVII. Fasting and Abstinence.

The new book by Dr. Barry and Dr. Delany entitled "The Religion of the Prayer Book," is a serious attempt to examine the various offices and rites, and to ascertain if possible just what kind of a religion the Prayer Book teaches. This is a subject of prime importance to all Churchmen in view of the revision of the Prayer Book that is now under way. It is also a subject that must interest all those who are perplexed by the various pronouncements of bishops and priests on matters of faith. For it cannot be insisted on too strongly that the Book of Common Prayer is for Anglicans the authoritative expression of the mind of the Church.

Edwin S. Gorham, Publisher
NEW YORK